

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XI, 3.

WHOLE No. 43.

I.—ON THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN POLYBIUS.¹

I.

In the following paper I have taken Hultsch's text of Polybius (books I–III in the second edition) as the basis of my work, and all the references are to the book, chapter and section in his edition. I have referred frequently to Schweighäuser's edition and notes, and his lexicon has been of great value to me. Of the studies on Polybius' text and language those to which I am most indebted are: Hultsch's Preface to his second edition, 1888; F. Krebs, *Die Präpositionen bei Polybius*, 1882, and *Die Präpositionsadverbien in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, Part I, 1884, Part II, 1885.

Kaelker, *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana*, 1880 (Leipziger Studien, Vol. III); J. Stich, *De Polybii dicendi genere* (Acta Sem. Philol. Erlang. II); L. Goetzeler, *De Polybi elocutione*, 1887, are occasionally referred to.

For the theory and development of the articular infinitive I am indebted to Prof. Gildersleeve's articles in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878, and in the American Journal of Philology, Vols. III and VIII; to Weiske's two papers in Fleckeisen's Jahrbuch for 1882, pp. 494 and 528, in which he enumerates every occurrence of the construction in Attic prose; and to Birklein's *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs*, 1888, which gives in a handy form an account of the development of the construction from Pindar to Xenophon. It

¹ The above paper embodies the results of studies pursued during the author's tenure of a Bishop Berkeley Fellowship at Owens College, Manchester, England.

is to be regretted that Aristotle's use of this construction has not yet been examined.

1. It has already been shown that while a historical development in the use of the article with an infinitive in 'classical' Greek can distinctly be traced, from the simple infinitive with *το* in Pindar to the substantivizing of a complex sentence in all sorts of case-relations in Attic prose (see Birklein, p. 91), at the same time both individual bent and the class of writing played their parts in the variations and the rise and fall of its use. As Prof. Gildersleeve says (A. J. P. III 197), 'the use of the articular infinitive is not simply a matter of period, but a matter of individual character and artistic school.'

In this essay I propose to apply the same methods of statistic which have been employed on the classical use of the articular infinitive, to an examination of the same element in the language of Polybius; an examination which will be of interest, and of some importance both from a comparative point of view and in regard to Polybius' own style. Thus I shall endeavor to connect Polybius' usage with that of the classical prosaists in a comparison by which the development of the construction may be estimated, and to provide material in which Polybius' method of thought and the turns of his language may be studied; for 'the articular infinitive is a gnomon of the reflective element and cannot be left out in a consideration of style' (Gildersleeve, Am. Philol. Assoc. 1878, p. 18).

The position of Polybius is one of prominence in the history of later Greek prose. He is in date and importance the first of a succession of writers in the *κοινή διάλεκτος*, and the traces of Polybius' influence are to be clearly seen in the writers who follow him. If the term *κοινή διάλεκτος* in reference to Polybius is calculated to lead to confusion, we may say that he writes in the Attic dialect but not in the Attic style; that in all essentials but that of pureness of vocabulary Polybius' dialect is Attic, though in detail he shows in syntax also many divergencies from Attic use.

It will thus be seen that in studying Polybius' language it is of importance to keep before us his relation with the Attic prosaists, because we are at a point where the threads of historical connection are most significant.

2. In the following statistical account of Polybius' usage of the articular infinitive I have calculated by the number of *articles*. It occurs altogether 1628 times, and in the following constructions:

nominative 151, subject accusative 75, object, etc., accus. 53, genitive 199, dative 80. With prepositions and quasi-prepositions governing the genitive: *περί* 26, *ὑπέρ* 26, *ἐκ* 22, *πρό* 12, *χάριν* 78, *ἐνεκα* 8, *πλήν* 5, *χωρίς* 4, *ἕως* 4, *ἔξω* 2, *ἀνευ* 2, *μέχρι* 2. With prepositions, etc., governing the dative: *ἐπί* 47, *πρός* 10, *ἐν* 21, *ἄμα* 102. With prepositions and the accusative: *διά* 441, *πρός* 134, *μετά* 29, *ἐπί* 31, *εἰς* 55, *περί* 8, *παρά* once.

In this list I have not separated the first five books in Polybius from the rest of his works which have come down to us. The first five books alone are preserved entire, of the rest we have only excerpts, mostly of considerable length. In Hultsch's edition books I-V occupy about a volume and a half, the excerpts about two volumes and a half. The average frequency (per page) of the articular infinitive is higher in the excerpts than in the first five books, being 1.180 : 1.109.

3. In the frequency of its occurrence the articular infinitive has a higher place in Polybius than in any classical author except Demosthenes. This relation will be best seen by the following comparison, in which I have adopted Birklein's counting of the classical occurrences. It occurs in Plato 1680 times, average per Teubner page .87; in Xenophon 1306 times, average 1.01; in Polybius 1628 times, average 1.15; in Demosthenes 788, average 1.20.

In estimating the force of these figures we must make allowance for the difference in character of the subject-matter. Oratory and philosophy, having more need of abstract phrases, of compendious and comprehensive locutions, are found to make more liberal use of the articular infinitive than history does. Thus in Thucydides (Gildersleeve, A. J. P. VIII, p. 330; Birklein, pp. 51, 52) the average of the art. inf. in the narrative is .30, while in the speeches it amounts to nearly 1; and thus we account for the higher frequency of the art. inf. in the excerpts of Polybius as compared with books I-V; books VI-end contain proportionally more of reflection and theorizing and less of narrative than the books preserved entire. But on the whole the *narrative* element with Polybius, as was natural with a writer of history, outweighs the reflective and historical. This being so, what we have to lay stress upon is the high frequency of the art. inf. in Polybius as compared with classical prose writers. It points to a real characteristic of his style, and of late Greek generally; to the 'conscious ratiocination, the increasing tendency towards the employment of

abstract nouns in various relations,' of which Prof. Gildersleeve (Trans. Am. Ph. Assoc. 1878, p. 18) describes the articular infinitive as the outcome, and which is further indicated in the large number of abstract nouns-substantive used by Polybius, many of which he coined himself. See Kaelker, l. c. pp. 296, 297, and Goetzeler, pp. 40, 41.

4. In the use of the articular infinitive as the equivalent of a noun, Polybius does not go beyond the limits fixed in Attic prose, for which see Birklein, p. 92. We find no approach in him to the later and vulgar use of an adjective instead of an adverb with the art. inf., or of a dependent genitive instead of a subject in the accus., such as those quoted by Gildersleeve, l. c. p. 7, from Ignatius, e. g. τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ. And in the usages within the classical limits his innovations are few in number. In Polybius for the first time we find the genitive of the art. inf. used of *price* (only twice), ἅμα τῷ c. inf. used almost synonymously with μετὰ τὸ c. inf., γίνομαι and εἰμί with πρὸς τὸ and πρὸς τῷ c. inf., πρὸς τὸ c. inf. of purpose in strictly final clauses. Of these usages occurring for the first time, all except the first occur frequently and are characteristics of Polybius' style; especially common is ἅμα with the art. inf. Other features of his use of the art. inf. as compared with that in Attic prose generally are the following: increase in frequency of χάριν τοῦ c. inf., to which ἕνεκα gives way; of διὰ τὸ c. inf., of ἐπὶ τῷ c. inf. expressing the cause of emotion; of πρὸς τὸ and μετὰ τὸ c. inf.; frequency of ὁρμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ c. inf., and of ἐλπίς τοῦ c. inf., decrease of the τὸ-infinitive. Noticeable are τοῦ c. inf. of purpose, and the variety of the expressions of purpose with the art. inf.: χάριν, ἕνεκα τοῦ c. inf., ἐπὶ τῷ c. inf., πρὸς τὸ c. inf., besides the final τοῦ c. inf.

5. The articular infinitive presents in a handy substantival form either the abstract idea expressed by the simple infinitive, or an oratio obliqua in which the infinitive stands for the main verb, and the subject is in the accusative (or nominative); cf. Gildersleeve, l. c. p. 11. There are thus two distinct forms of the articular infinitive, the former of which is strictly the equivalent of an abstract noun, while the latter is a substantivized sentence, and in general a variation in phrase for what might otherwise have been expressed by a subordinate clause, relational or temporal, or by a participle. Of the former class Polybius very frequently employs τὸ ζῆν as an equivalent of ὁ βίος, the two occurring side by side in 12, 16, 12 τῷ μὲν ('to the one') ἔτη δύο ἢ τρία καταλείπεσθαι τοῦ ζῆν,

αὐτῷ δὲ τοῦ βίου τὸ πλεῖον ἔτι μένειν. So too he is fond of τὸ νικᾶν, κινδυνεύειν, βοηθεῖν, etc. It is interesting to note that there are certain constructions in Polybius with which the simple form of the art. inf. goes naturally. Thus (of course with exceptions) it is the simple abstract that is found when the art. inf. is the direct object of verbs, or in the genitive after verbs, or after πρὸς, εἰς, ἐπὶ τὸ (always), περὶ τὸ, ἐν, ἐκ, ἕνεκα and χάριν. On the other hand, it is the substantivized oratio obliqua that is usually found after μετὰ and πρό; while some constructions, e. g. the 'dynamic' dative, ἐπὶ τῷ, ἅμα τῷ, lend themselves equally to both forms. With the other usages, although both forms of the art. inf. are equally natural, the simpler is the more usual.

In a few passages we find the startling irregularity of an accusative with the art. inf. where the subject of the main clause and of the oratio obliqua is the same. 2, 18, 6 οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν ἀντεξαγαγεῖν Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ στρατόπεδα διὰ τὸ παραδόξου γενομένης τῆς ἐφόδου προκαταληφθῆναι καὶ μὴ καταταχῆσαι τὰς τῶν συμμάχων ἀθροίσαντας δυνάμεις. See Hultsch², Praefat. p. 1. Hultsch reverts here to the MSS reading ἀθροίσαντας, after having, in the first edition, preferred Bekker's conjecture ἀθροίσαντες. In doing so he follows Kaelker, p. 280, who compares the following passages where a similar accusative is found: 2, 7, 10 οὐδὲν ἐποίησαντο προυργιαίτερον τοῦ παροπλίσαντας αὐτοὺς ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς πλοῖα. 3, III, 2. 8, 31, 6 ἐλπίζων καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν τι διατείνειν τὴν εὐαγρίαν διὰ τὸ μερίτην αὐτῷ γίνεσθαι, where, as Hultsch points out, the accusative is due to the influence of αὐτόν, but where Bekker conjectured μερίτης. Analogous to these is 9, 39, 6 πρέπον ὑμῖν ἔστι τὸ—μνησθέντας—μισοπονηρῆσαι, where one expects the dative as in 18, 14, 13.

The irregularity of the passages quoted is, as Hultsch, l. c. p. li, remarks, quite in keeping with the construction of the accusative referring to the subject which is found in oratio obliqua after νομίζω, etc., e. g. 1, 53, 10 νομίσαντες οὐκ ἀξιώχρεως σφᾶς αὐτοὺς εἶναι. See Hultsch, l. c. p. xlv, on 1, 38, 1; and Kaelker, p. 280. The above-quoted passages excepted, however, we find the nominative always with the art. inf. in Polybius when the subject of the main sentence is referred to.

6. (a). The articular infinitive in its capacity as a substantive often stands in Polybius parallel in construction with a noun, the two being connected by καί. In Demosthenes (Weiske, l. c. p. 495), with whom this is common, when they both refer to the same thing, the noun gives the general aspect of it, and the art.

inf. the particular. Thus too in Polybius 1, 88, 3 μεγάλην ἔχει διαφορὰν ἢ μετριότης καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἀνέκестον ἐπιτηδεύειν ἐκουσίως, and 5, 1, 5. 20, 5, 4. 27, 13, 4. Noticeable is 7, 13, 7 ἐγγενεσάμενος αἵματος ἀνθρωπίου καὶ τοῦ φονεύειν. Other instances of the conjunction of noun and art. inf., where they do not refer to the same thing, are 15, 34, 6 ἅμα τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀπέβαλε. 8, 32, 11. 18, 54, 2.

(δ). With αὐτό as attribute (Birklein, p. 93) we find the art. inf. 12, 28a, 2 αὐτὸ τὸ συναθροῖσθαι φησι μείζον ἔργον εἶναι, and 22, 13, 3 δῆλος ὢν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ σιωπᾶν. 15, 31, 13 περιποιήσασθαι τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸ μόνον.

(c). In apposition (Birklein, p. 94) the art. inf. is found several times after τοῦτο, especially αὐτὸ τοῦτο. 3, 4, 9 οὐ γὰρ τοῦτ' εἶναι τέλος ὑποληπτέον, τὸ νικῆσαι. So 4, 57, 11. 21, 22, 7. Frag. 46. 3, 84, 7 τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐθισμῶν αὐτὸ περὶ πλείστον ποιούμενοι, τὸ μὴ φεύγειν μηδὲ λείπειν τὰς τάξεις. 3, 20, 4. 12, 5, 11. After ἐπ' αὐτῷ τοῦτ' 1, 45, 11. 37, 1, 9. ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τούτου 1, 45, 11. τοῦτ' διαλλάττειν, διαφέρειν 2, 37, 11. 30, 2, 4. For 12, 6a, 4 see under the dative.

Occasionally we find the art. inf. appositional to a noun, e. g. after ἐλπίδος 2, 35, 8. See below under the accusative.

7. *Tenses of the infinitive.*—As in Attic prose so in Polybius we find the present the commonest tense of the infinitive with the article. After the present the aorist is next in frequency, with about half as many occurrences as the present, while the perfect is much rarer (one-seventh of the present) and the future only occurs 12 times. We may notice the exclusive use of the aorist inf. after μετὰ τὸ and its prevalence after ἅμα τῷ and χάριν τοῦ; aorist and present are found in equal degree after εἰς τὸ, but in all other constructions the present, as is natural, is preponderant. The perfect is found in the largest proportion after ἐπὶ τῷ and διὰ τὸ.

The future of the articular infin. is such a rarity that it is worth while enumerating the instances. It occurs for the first time in Thucydides (see Birklein, pp. 52 and 94), and it is either used pleonastically in connection with phrases which contain an idea of purpose or futurity, as ἐλπίς, πρόληψις; or in oratio obliqua to express an action in the future. Of the former class in Polybius are 3, 48. 2 ἐλπίς τοῦ κατορθώσκειν, and 7, 15, 4. 5, 94, 9 ἐλπίς ὑπὲρ τοῦ c. fut. infin., 16, 32, 4 πρόληψις τοῦ πεσεῖσθαι. 4, 3, 3 πρόληψιν ἔχειν περὶ τοῦ c. fut. Frag. 150 φροντίζειν τοῦ c. fut. infin. After εἰς τὸ of purpose 9, 9, 11. χάριν τοῦ 4, 9, 5. On the other hand, the future has its full force in 3, 5, 8 διὰ τὸ κάλλους πολλοὺς κατεγγυηθῆσθαι καὶ σπουδάσειν, and 32, 16, 2. 24, 11, 14 ποιείσθαι ὅρκους ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδέποτε κατελεύσεσθαι τοὺς φυγάδας, and 5, 18, 6 ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ δεινὸν ἦξειν ἐπὶ σφᾶς οὐδὲ διενοεῖτο οὐδεὶς.

Somewhat similar is the use of *ἄν* with the aorist inf. which we find after διὰ τὸ 1, 61, 5. 3, 31, 3, and in 7, 13, 4 τὸν βίον ἐφήσαμεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τὸ μηδὲν ἂν ποιῆσαι μοχθηρόν.

Madvig, Syntax, §172b, laid it down of the *meaning* of the articular aorist infinitive with accusative subject, that except when denoting purpose of any kind it always has a *preterite* force. Upon this Birklein, p. 95, remarks, that although it usually holds good, there are many such examples in which the aorist is not preterite. Thus he quotes Thuc. 7, 68 τὸ δὲ τούσδε κολασθῆναι καλὸς ὁ ἀγών. Thus too we may add from Polybius, 4, 84, 8 κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον συμφέρει τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις τὸ γενέσθαι Φίλιππον Ἡλείων κύριον. 6, 24, 7 ἀδήλου γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν τι τὸν ἡγεμόνα, οὐδέποτε βούλονται κ. τ. λ. And 11, 17, 2 ἐπὶ τὸ καταλειπόμενον ὥρμησε τῆς ὁλῆς ἐπιβολῆς· τοῦτο δ' ἦν τὸ μὴ διαφυγεῖν τὸν Μαχανίδα.

The Infinitive with τὸ as Subject and Object, etc.

The infinitive with τὸ as subject in nominative and accusative, and as object, etc., occurs altogether 279 times in Polybius (89 in books I-V, 190 in the rest); a frequency which shows a great fall from that of Dem., Plat., and Xenophon. Taking the proportion by the page in the Teubner text, we find the average frequency per page of the infinitive with τὸ in the writers just mentioned is .4, but .19 or less than half of this in Polybius. This falling off is due to a large extent to the fact that the τὸ-inf. especially, and the art. inf. in general, is more consonant with a didactical and theoretical subject-matter than with narration. This is very clearly shown by the case of Xenophon himself; see Birklein, Entwickl., p. 84: in the Memorabilia the frequency of the art. inf. in all constructions is 2.2, but in the Anabasis it is only .47; while, to take the τὸ-inf. by itself, we find its frequency in the Memorabilia is 1.07, but only .15 in the Anabasis. And in Polybius also the use of the subject infinitive with τὸ is chiefly characteristic of the non-narrative portions, being especially common in the digressions where Polybius explains the plan or purpose of the narrative; while the preponderance in Polybius of the narrative element accounts for the fall in the frequency of the τὸ-infinitive as compared with Demosthenes, Plato, and Xenophon.

1. As subject the τὸ-infinitive appears 151 times as nominative and 77 times as accusative. In the latter case it is the subject in an oblique sentence after νομίζω, φημί, ἡγοῦμαι, or in 'oblique narration'

with no governing verb expressed; less frequently the governing verb is ὑπολαμβάνω, κρίνω, εἶποι τις ἂν, πέπεισμαι, οἶμαι.

The tense of the infinitive is generally the present, but the aorist is almost as frequent; the perfect occurs only 6 times. Often an infinitival sentence with a subject in the accusative is substantivized by the τό. The predicate to the infinitive-subject is often an adjective with or without εἶναι, but in this case the article is not so necessary with the infinitive as when the predicate is a verb.¹

The frequent recurrence of the same or a similar predicate shows the mannerism and stereotype character of Polybius' style.

Thus with σημείον, 11, 7, 3 τὸ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὀργιζόμενον εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβεῖν τῆς πάσης ἀλογιστίας ἐστὶ σημείον. So 10, 32, 12 τὸ λέγειν ὡς οὐκ ἂν φόβον, τίς γὰρ ἂν ἤλπισε τοῦτο γενέσθαι; μέγιστον εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ σημείον ἀπειρίας στρατηγικῆς. 2, 63, 5. 12, 6b, 3. 29, 5, 1. 30, 7, 8. Frag. 85. With ῥάδιον: 6, 3, 2 τὸ τε γὰρ ἐξαγγεῖλαι τὰ γινωσκόμενα ῥάδιον, τό τε προειπεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος εὐμαρές. And 5, 33, 6. 12, 20, 7. 12, 25c, 5. 25i, 9. 28, 10, 2. With ἀναγκαῖον: 1, 1, 1 ἴσως ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τὸ προτρέπεσθαι πάντας πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν τῶν τοιούτων ὑπομνημάτων. And 1, 13, 6. 3, 21, 9. 12, 25i, 5. 3, 97, 1 νομίσαντες χρήσιμον εἶναι, μᾶλλον δ' ἀναγκαῖον τὸ μὴ προῖεσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν ἀλλ' ἐνίστασθαι τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις, and similarly after νομίζω with ἀναγκαῖον 1, 10, 9. 16, 25, 2. 32, 4, 2. After ἡγεῖσθαι 9, 36, 11. 10, 2, 1. 9, 8. 18, 32, 13.

With the perfect infinitive: 1, 4, 2 τὸ προκαλεσάμενον ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς ἱστορίας μάλιστα τοῦτο γέγονεν, σὺν δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τὸ μηδένα τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιβεβλησθαι τῇ τῶν καθόλου πραγμάτων συντάξει.²

¹ The choice in such cases between the articular and the simple infinitive was no doubt often arbitrary, as, e. g. 29, 23, 3 οὐκ ἤρεσκε διδόναι followed by ἤρεσκε τὸ διδόναι. But the article was often omitted to avoid the hiatus; this is clear from such a case as 6, 56, 15 σπάνιον ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν—σπάνιον ἐστὶ τὸ λαβεῖν. Cf. 8, 2, 6 σπάνιον εὐρεῖν ἐστὶ.

² 1, 35, 2 καὶ γὰρ τὸ διαπιστεῖν τῇ τύχῃ—ἐναργέστατον ἐφάνη πᾶσιν τότε διὰ τῶν Μάρκων συμπτωμάτων. "Fortunae non esse confidendum manifestum" Schw. Casaubon, feeling the want of δεῖν, read from late MSS τὸ δεῖν ἀπιστεῖν, which Schweighäuser rejects, remarking that the phrase is 'proverbialiter et sententiose dictum, quo in genere amant Graeci omittere verbum δεῖ.' It appears to me much more probable that the original was τὸ δεῖν διαπιστεῖν, from which both the later variant τὸ δεῖν ἀπιστεῖν and the vulgate τὸ διαπιστεῖν would naturally arise. For the omission by copyists of δεῖ before διὰ and δια- there are several parallels; compare 9, 42, 6 and Hultsch, Praef.² xxxii.

23, 7, 4 ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος καὶ Περσεὺς οὐχ ἡδέως ἑώρων τὸ γινόμενον οὐδ' ἤρεσεν αὐτοῖς, τῷ δοκεῖν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους αὐτῶν μηθένα λόγον ποιεῖσθαι. Here Ursinus read τῷ, but τὸ is read in O, and the latter is surely preferable. τὸ has the support of the following passages: 29, 23, 3 τοῖς δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀρχωνα ἤρεσκε τὸ διδόναι. 4, 49, 3 ἡρέθιζε δ' αὐτὸν τὸ δοκεῖν Βυζαντίους ἐξαπεσταλκέναι.

As accusative-subject, besides the above-quoted instances the τὸ-infinitive occurs as follows: 2, 22, 11 νομίζοντες συμφέρειν σφίσι τὸ διακριθῆναι πρὸς τούτους. So 7, 4, 8. νομίζων καθήκειν αὐτῷ 21, 29, 12. 31, 8, 7. 37, 3, 2. And 6, 1, 6. 50, 3. 21, 13, 8. 18, 6. In 10, 7, 6 Schweigh. added ἐπισφαλές εἶναι, a conjecture which is supported by 28, 6, 4. Frag. 163. 11, 20, 6 and 28, 13, 10. ἡγεῖσθαι σφίσι συμφέρειν 5, 35, 12. 10, 39, 9. Similarly after ἡγεῖσθ. 2, 50, 6. 3, 1, 5. 5, 67, 13. 6, 42, 2.

5, 11, 4 τὸ δὲ ναοὺς ἅμα δὲ τούτοις ἀνδριάντας λυμαίνεσθαι, πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποι τις εἶναι τρόπον καὶ θυμῷ λυτῶντος ἔργον; so 9, 10, 6. 17, 9. 32, 27, 7. After φημί 1, 80, 1. 5, 58, 4. 6, 1, 3. 12, 28a, 2. 13, 3, 6. 18, 36, 7. 22, 8, 6. 28, 21, 3. 29, 8, 7. Frag. 13. φάσκω 16, 26, 1. 4, 57, 11 ὑπολαμβάνοντες τοῦτο τέλος εἶναι, τὸ γενέσθαι τῶν πυλώνων ἐντός. And 1, 4, 4. 2, 47, 1. 12, 28a, 4 and 5. 29, 7, 6. Frag. 46. 2, 26, 8. τὸ μὲν διακινδυνεύειν ἐκ παρατάξεως οὐδαμῶς ἔκρινε συμφέρειν. 3, 107, 2. 5, 22, 8. 16, 20, 6.

As subject in oratio obliqua with no principal verb expressed we find the τὸ-infinitive 3, 15, 7 πάτριον γὰρ εἶναι Καρχηδονίοις τὸ μηδένα τῶν ἀδικουμένων περιουρᾶν. And 3, 63, 4 and 11. 4, 24, 6. 9, 42, 7. 18, 3, 8. 11, 8. 21, 22, 7. 22, 11, 4. 24, 14, 3. 31, 20, 6. 34, 4, 4. 37, 1, 4 and 15.

29, 19, 8 (in oratio obliqua) * * τὸ δὲ παρέντας ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν νῦν παρῆναι σπουδάζοντας διαλύειν τὸν πόλεμον, προφανές εἶναι τοῖς ὀρθῶς σκοπομένοις διότι τὰς πρεσβείας ἐξέπεμψαν οὐ διαλύειν ἐθέλοντες τὸν πόλεμον, ἀλλ' ἐξελέσθαι τὸν Περσέα. Here we have either an anacoluthon or some defect in the text. τῷ δὲ παρέντας would restore a construction, but the commencement τὸ δὲ παρέντ. seems to read soundly although preceded by a lacuna. Probably the sentence was begun with an infinitive with τὸ, and in the course of a long period the construction was forgotten.

9, 4, 6 ἐξ ὧν συλλογιζόμενος Ἀντίβας ἀδύνατον ὑπάρχον τὸ λῦσαι τὴν πολιορκίαν. After πεπεισμένος 1, 83, 3. οἶμαι 12, 25k, 9.

Lastly, in two passages which may well be regarded as specimens of involved structure, we find the accus. of the art. inf. as subject of an infinitival sentence also substantivized by an article. 9, 2 4, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ καινῆς ἐξηγήσεως δεῖσθαι, τῷ μὴ συμβατὸν εἶναι τὸ τὰς ἐπιγινόμενας πράξεις ἡμῖν ἐξαγγεῖλαι. 22, 13, 8 διατιθεμένων λόγους ὑπὲρ τοῦ—ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸ κινῆσαι τι τῶν ὑποκειμένων.

2. As object, or in apposition to an object.

(a). The τὸ-infinitive as object is oftenest found with certain verbs indicating *rejection* of any project or plan. It thus occurs

10 times with ἀπογινώσκω and 8 times with ἀποδοκιμάζω, and with παρήμι, ἀπολέγω, ἐγκακέω. 1, 44, 4 τὸ μὲν διακωλύειν τὴν ἐπίπλουν τῆς βοηθείας ἀπέγνωσαν. So 1, 48, 10. 2, 65, 13. 3, 21, 6. 74, 5. 5, 1, 5. 70, 2. 8, 36, 2. 14, 10, 10. 31, 23, 8.

3, 95, 5 τὸ κατὰ γῆν ἀπαντᾶν ἀπεδοκίμασε, and 1, 54, 5. 3, 86, 8. 6, 38, 1. 9, 20, 6. 10, 39, 7. 18, 48, 9. 31, 17, 3.

3, 106, 10 τὸ πλείω γράφειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν παρήσομεν. 2, 63, 1 ἀπολέγω τὸ χορηγεῖν. ἐγκακέω 'refuse' 4, 19, 10.

The phrase ἐκλείπειν τὸ ζῆν occurs three times, 2, 41, 2. 2, 60, 7 and 23, 10, 3. περὶ πλείονος ποιῶμαι, περὶ πλείστον ποιῶμαι with τὸ c. inf. occurs four times, 3, 84, 7 τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐθισμῶν περὶ πλείστον ποιούμενοι, τὸ μὴ φεύγειν μηδὲ λείπειν τὰς τάξεις. So 4, 61, 6. 18, 53, 3, and 24, 15, 3.

3, 81, 6 τὸ ζῆν αὐτῶν ἀφῆρηται. 15, 34, 6 ἅμα τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀπέβαλε. 16, 34, 11 οὐδαμῶς ὑπέμενον τὸ ζῆν. 11, 28, 8 ἀποκτενῶν τούτον παρ' οὗ τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸς ἔλαβε. 15, 31, 13 περιποιήσασθαι τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸ μόνον. 3, 63, 6 τοῖς ἐλομένοις τὸ ζῆν 'choosing.' 10, 37, 4 κλῆν ἢ τύχη δῶ τὸ νικᾶν. 31, 23, 8 προορώμενοι ('fearing') τὸ βουλευθέντες κωλύειν ἀδυνατῆσαι. After ζηλόω 'strive after' 23, 11, 3. λέγω 12, 28a, 7. 39, 10, 8 τὸ δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν πραγμάτων παθεῖν ὅ τι δέοι, οὐδ' ἐν νῶ ἔλαμβάνον. 27, 9, 7 μαρτύριον ἐποιοῦντο τῆς ἐαυτῶν ἀποφάσεως τὸ παραγεγονέναι ἀλείπτειν τινά. 7, 13, 4 τότε περὶ υἱὸν Ἀράτου τὸν βίον ἐφήταμεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τὸ μηδὲν ἂν ποιῆσαι μοχθηρόν. Here τὸ is Schw.'s emendation of MSS τοῦ: "His life would show in his defence that he would not have committed anything base"; but the construction is very unusual.

16, 10, 1 ἐξ οὗ δὴ καὶ μάλιστ' ἂν τις καταμάθοιτο μανιώδη γενόμενον Φίλιππον τοῦτο πράξει. So Mai edited, but Heyse corrected to καταμάθοι τὸ, which is adopted by Hultsch. It must be admitted, however, that the article has a very clumsy effect. Compare 5, 11, 7 Μάλιστα δ' ἂν τις καταμάθοι τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τὴν τότε Φιλίππου, λαβὼν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν κ. τ. λ. Perhaps the middle voice in καταμάθοιτο is simply due to a copyist's mistake for καταμάθοι.¹

¹ 29, 24, 3 ἐξ ὧν ἀπεδείκνυσαν σκῆψιν οὖσαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων χρεῖαν πρὸς τὸ διαλύσαι *το βοηθεῖν. Here the article before βοηθεῖν was added by Ursinus, but does not improve the sense. In the sense required here, διαλύειν is not found elsewhere in Polybius, although it is frequently used of disbanding troops, and, in the middle voice, of raising a siege, or finishing a war. For references see Schw.'s lex. The gulf which separates these regular significations of διαλύειν from that which is required in this passage is thus bridged by Schweighäuser: "dissolvere vel dirimere negotium aut consilium, i. e. impedire; sic 29, 24, 3

(b). Accus. of the art. inf. in apposition to a direct object: 7, 8, 9 σκοπὸν προέθηκε κάλλιστον ἐν τῷ ζῆν, τὸ πειθαρχεῖν. 3, 20, 4 εἰ μὴ ἡ τύχη καὶ τοῦτο προσέειπε τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις, τὸ φρονεῖν εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς. 12, 5, 11 αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο διορθώσαιντο, τὸ μὴ παῖδα ποιεῖν φιαληφόρον ἀλλὰ παρθένον. Here may be added 12, 25k, 7 κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο χάριν ἔχει τοῖς Γελοίοις, τὸ μὴ γίνεσθαι τοὺς λόγους ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς. Here the MSS have a lacuna, which Heyse supplied, reading κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο χάριν for κατα . . . χάριν. In two passages the accus. of the art. inf. is found in apposition to πρᾶγμα ποιῶν: 6, 1, 12 πρᾶγμα ποιῶν φρονίμου καὶ νουνεχοῦς ἀνδρός, τὸ γνῶναι κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον ὅσῳ πλεόν ἤμισυ παντός. 18, 33, 2 ποιῶν πρᾶγμα βασιλικόν, τὸ μηδὲ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς λήθην ποιείσθαι τοῦ καθήκοντος. Compare 4, 80, 4 with the nominative of the art. inf.: καλὸν τοῦτο Δεπρέταις ἔργον πέπροκται τὸ—ἀντιποιήσασθαι τῆς ἐαυτῶν πατρίδος καὶ μὴ προσέσθαι τὰς ἐλπίδας. Similar, but looser in structure, is 5, 11 3 τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραιρεῖσθαι τῶν πολεμίων καὶ καταφθεῖρειν φρούρια κ. τ. λ.—ταῦτα μὲν ἀναγκάζουσιν οἱ τοῦ πολέμου νόμοι δρᾶν· τὸ δὲ κ. τ. λ., where ταῦτα μὲν takes up the preceding τὸ μὲν.

3. Accusative absolute.

This is a rare use of the accus. of the art. inf., which occurs also in Plato and Xenophon; see Birklein, pp. 77, 100, and compare the genitive absolute. In Polybius it occurs only 2, 61, 3 τῆς γενναιότητος οὐδὲ κατὰ ποσὸν ἐποίησατο μνήμην, ὥσπερ τὸ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι οἰκειότερον ὑπάρχον τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ τὰ καλὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπισημαίνεσθαι.

4. Accusative of relation.

See Birklein, pp. 85, 97. This use of the τὸ-infinitive, in free relation with the whole sentence ("as regards"), is very common in classical prose, especially in Xenophon. Thus Cyr. 1, 6, 16, quoted by Birklein, τὸ γὰρ ἀρχὴν μὴ κάμνειν τὸ στράτευμα, τοίτου σοι δεῖ

διαλῦσαι τὸ βοηθεῖν est impedire ne mittatur auxilium." I think the original reading here was διακωλύσαι βοηθεῖν, which gives exactly the required sense, and involves nothing more than Ursinus' addition of τὸ does.

For parallels compare: 4, 33, 8 ἐκώλυνον Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετέχειν τῶν σπονδῶν Μεσσηνίων. 20, 10, 6 τοῦδ' ἀδυνάτου κωλύσαντος βουλευσασθαι περὶ τῶν ἐπιταττομένων. 18, 41a, 1 κωλύειν τὸν Ἀντιόχον παραπλεῖν. and 30, 9, 8. These passages show that in Polybius, as in Attic, the construction of κωλύω without μὴ is permissible. μὴ is, however, found in 15, 13, 9 ἐκώλυνσε μὴ παραδέξασθαι τοὺς ἐγγίζοντας, and 22, 11, 3 τῶν γὰρ νόμων κωλύντων μηθὲν δῶρα λαμβάνειν, where, however, κελυνόντων would be an improvement.

It is true that in the above-quoted passages κωλύω, and not its compound, is the word; but διακωλύω is found in Attic with the infinitive without and with μὴ, and Polyb. 1, 44, 4 is in phrase and meaning closely parallel to our passage: τὸ μὲν διακωλύειν τὸν ἐπίπλουν τῆς βοηθείας ἀπέγνωσαν.

μέλειν. Of this character in Polybius is 9, 9, 2 τὸ προσβαλόντα τοῖς πολεμίοις πειραθῆναι λύειν τὴν πολιορκίαν καὶ τὸ—ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὀρμῆσαι τὴν Ῥώμην,—τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐπισημαίναιτο καὶ θαυμάσαι τὸν προειρημένον ἐπὶ τούτοις ἡγεμόνα.

5, 31, 3 τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ τῆς ἀκριβείας διαμαρτάνειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἱκανὴν τοῖς φιλομαθοῦσι πεπείσμεθα παρασκευάζειν ἐμπειρίαν· τὸ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον καὶ σαφὴ γίνεσθαι τὴν διήγησιν, οὐδὲν ἀναγκαιότερον ἡγοῦμεθ' εἶναι τοῦ μὴ συμπλέκειν ἀλλήλαις τὰς πράξεις. Attempts have here been made to emend the τὸ-infinitive, but Reiske's τῷ δ' gives a wrong sense, and Casaubon's πρὸς δὲ τὸ introduces a hiatus. Close parallels might be quoted to show that a final clause would be natural here; thus ἀναγκαῖον is frequently joined by P. with a final clause, e. g. with ἵνα I, 3, 9. 3, 21, 9. 2, 56, 2., with χάριν τοῦ c. inf. 2, 14, 2. 9, 20, 2. 18, 28, 12. Very analogous too in point of phraseology are 3, 36, I ἵνα δὲ μὴ παντάπασιν ἀσαφὴ γίνεσθαι συμβαίνει τὴν διήγησιν, ῥητέον κ. τ. λ. I, 47, I ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι τοὺς τόπους ἀσαφὴ τὰ λεγόμενα γίνηται, πειρασόμεθα κ. τ. λ. and 32, 25, 7 συγκεφαλαιωσόμεθα τὴν ὅλην πρᾶξιν, ἵνα μὴ—εὐτελεῖ καὶ—ἀσαφὴ ποιῶμεν τὴν διήγησιν. In the light of these passages the obvious correction of 5, 31, 3 would be τοῦ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον, were it not for the clumsy and obscure construction which would result from having in the same sentence *two* τοῦ c. inf. clauses; and it seems probable that the use of τὸ c. inf. here is to be referred mainly to the wish to avoid the clumsy construction which would be involved in a final genitive of the infinitive—otherwise the natural phrase here. Hultsch rightly defends the accusative, and is supported by Krebs, P.-A. I 53, and 58 note. Krebs quotes from Dion. H. 8, 44 οὕτ' αἰδοῦς προνοοῦμεναι, τὸ μὴ ὀρᾶσθαι.

The τὸ-infinitive of relation was wrongly introduced by Dindorf in several passages where τοῦ μὴ is the correct reading. See under the genitive.

Genitive.

Polybius uses the articular infinitive altogether 199 times in the genitive case, 75 in books I–V, and 124 in the remaining books. This is about the same degree of frequency as in Plato and Xenophon, but is lower than in Thucydides, and still more so than in Demosthenes.

I. With verbs it occurs 79 times, a frequency lower than those of Demosthenes and Xenophon, who especially affect this construction.

The verbs which in Polybius enter into construction with the

genitive of the articular infin. are nearly all of a character which do not admit of a construction with the simple infinitive without the article. They are joined elsewhere with a noun in the genitive, and an infinitive in construction with them has to bear the sign of its case. Consequently after verbs, except in the case of ἀρχεσθαι, ἀπελπίζειν, and παρ' οὐδὲν ἐλθεῖν, we do not find the simple infinitive varying with τοῦ c. inf. as we do to some extent in the construction of nouns with the genitive of the art. inf.

As in classical writers (see Birklein, pp. 98, 99), so in Polybius we find an illogical μὴ with the genitive of the art. inf. after verbs of hindering and separation, etc. Thus: 2, 37, 11 τοῖσιν μόνον διαλλάττειν τοῦ μὴ μιᾶς πόλεως διάθεσιν ἔχειν τὴν Πελοπόννησον, τῇ μὴ κ. τ. λ. 5, 4, 10 τοὺς νεανίσκους διέτρεψαν τοῦ μὴ τελεσιουργῆσαι τὴν κατάληψιν τῆς πόλεως. 2, 14, 6 ὁ λείπει τοῦ μὴ συνάπτειν αὐτῷ. 18, 22, 4 ἐμπόδιον ἦν τοῦ μὴ τρέψασθαι τοὺς πολεμίους (where the note in Hultsch is misprinted—τὸ and τοῦ should exchange places). In the three last of these cases Dindorf, consistently with his treatment of similar passages in Xenophon (see Dindorf's preface to his edition of Polybius I 52), substitutes τὸ μὴ for τοῦ μὴ of the original; a totally arbitrary proceeding which would introduce a construction unknown to Polybius.

Polybius' use of τοῦ c. inf. is characterized by the recurrence in the narrative of certain favorite phrases in which he indulges to an immoderate degree. Thus ἀπέχειν, ἀφένεος, and ἀφιστάναί are, between them, responsible for five-eighths of the genitives of the art. inf. in Polybius.

τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν τοῦ c. inf. in classical prose is confined to Isocrates and Demosthenes (Birklein, p. 62), with both of whom it is a favorite expression; but neither of them is so fond of it as Polybius, who has 19 examples of the phrase. In Demosthenes and Isocrates τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν is the most usual phrase, but other conjuncts, such as πολὺ ἀπέχειν (Dem. 20, 49), ἴσον ἀπέχειν (Dem. 15, 1), are found. In Polybius, however, it is *always* in the phrase τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν ὥστε or ὡς that ἀπέχειν occurs with the genitive of the articular infinitive, except in one passage, 22, 4, 10, which is probably corrupt.

Examples: 2, 6, 9 τοσοῦτον ἀπέχον τοῦ πειράζειν ἀμύνεσθαι τοὺς ἡδικηκότας ὥστε τούναντίον συμμαχίαν ἔθεντο. So 1, 31, 5. 5, 9, 9. 74, 7. 12, 4d, 2. 22, 6, 2. 23, 17, 4. 24, 10, 9. 11, 14. 32, 23, 1.

Repetitions of the same phrase are noticeable, and throw light on the fixed character of Polybius' style: 2, 57, 3 and 9, 36, 4 τοῦ

παθεῖν τι δεινόν. 3, 8, 11 and 6, 58, 10 τοῦ πράξαι τι τῶν προειρημένων. 15, 5, 5 and 39, 18, 6 τοῦ κολάζειν. 21, 20, 9 and 39, 15, 2 τοῦ προσδέξασθαι τι τούτων.

32, 14, 7 τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχετο κομίσασθαι τι ὡν πρότερον ἔδωρήσατο. This Bekker corrected to ἀπέσχε τοῦ κομίσασθαι κ. τ. λ., comparing the identical words in Diod. 31, 27, 7 τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχε τοῦ κομίσασθαι τι τῶν πρότερον δωρηθέντων.

22, 4, 10 οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ τοῦ μὲν διὰ στρατοπέδων ποιῆσθαι τὴν ἔφοδον ἀπέσχον, πρῆσβεύτας δὲ προχειρίσαντο πέμπειν. Here the MSS reading τῶν μὲν was corrected by Ursinus to τοῦ μὲν διὰ, but some further correction is still necessary. Apart from the fact that ἀπέχω everywhere else has τοσοῦτον with it—which is enough to suggest suspicion—the use of the active of ἀπέχω in the sense of 'refrain from' is unexampled. For parallels to ἀπέχεσθαι τοῦ c. infin. Weiske, p. 500, may be referred to. But the likeliest emendation of ἀπέσχον seems to me to be ἀπέστησαν, which is one of Polybius' favorite expressions. The following passages offer a close analogy to the above-quoted 22, 4, 10, in point of structure as well as sense: 1, 39, 7 τοῦ μὲν ἔτι στόλον ἀθροίζειν ἀπέστησαν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κ. τ. λ. 10, 15, 8 τοῦ μὲν φονεῦν ἀπέστησαν, ὥρμησαν δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἀρπαγὰς. 16, 31, 8 τοῦ μὲν ἀντιμεταλλεῦν ἀπέστησαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοιαύτην γνώμην κ. τ. λ. 3, 19, 4 τοῦ μὲν διακωλύειν τοὺς ἀποβαίνοντας ἀπέστησαν, συναθροίσαντες δὲ, ὥρμησαν, and similarly 14, 5, 5.

ἀφίσταναι τοῦ c. inf., like ἀπέχειν, is a favorite with Demosth., and occurs 9 times in Polybius. Besides the above-quoted passages it is found 1, 87, 2 οὐ μὴν ἀφίσταντο τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν. 3, 2, 5. 4, 71, 1. In 2, 35, 8 the gen. of the inf. is in apposition to the genitive governed by the verb: οὐκ ἂν τις ἀποσταίῃ τῆς τελευταίας ἐλπίδος, τοῦ διαγωνίζεσθαι.

Like Xenophon (see Birklein, p. 88), Polybius joins ἀπογινώσκειν both with the genitive and the accusative infin. The latter is the commoner construction and Dindorf wishes to alter the three cases where ἀπογινώσκειν has τοῦ c. inf. These are 1, 29, 5 τοῦ μὲν παραφυλάττειν τὸν ἐπίπλουν ἀπέγνωσαν. 1, 48, 1 τοῦ δὲ λυμάνεσθαι καὶ διαφθεῖρειν τὰς παρασκευὰς ἀπεγνωκότων. 9, 7, 9 τοῦ μὲν ἔτι προσκαρτερεῖν τούτοις ἀπέγνω. It need hardly be said, however, that Dindorf's proposals are rejected by Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst; see Hultsch³ on 1, 29, 5.

ἀφήμενος has τοῦ c. infin. eight times; the active participle of ἀφίημι occurs, however, once, 18, 3, 3. Examples: 2, 68, 3 ἀφήμενοι τοῦ χρῆσθαι ταῖς τῶν τύπων εὐκαιρίαις, τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἐποίησαν. 5, 104, 5, 6,

I, 1. II, 14, 6 ἀφέντος τοῦ μένειν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων—τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἔπραξεν. and 15, 29, 7. 16, 6, 7. 20, 9, 9. 31, 7, 3.

18, 3, 3 ἀφέντα γὰρ τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀπαντᾶν τοῖς πολεμίοις, φεύγοντα τὰς πόλεις ἐμπιμπράναι καὶ διαρπάζειν. Here we find ἀφίεναι used intransitively with a genitive, a usage for which I can find no parallel. Possibly Aristot. Probl. 8, 9 ἀφέντες τοῦ κινδύνου is analogous (Bonitz).¹

Similarly the following verbs are found with the genitive of the art. inf.: ἀντέχομαι 5, 100, 11 ἀντείχετο τοῦ πράττειν τι τῶν ἐξῆς. ἐφίεμαι 28, 9, 4 ἐφίενται τοῦ μεγάλα τολμᾶν. ὀρέγομαι 21, 23, 3. ὀλιγώρω 5, 66, 6 τοῦ γυμνάζειν τοὺς ὄχλους ὀλιγώρει. and 20, 10, 16 ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀλιγώρησαν τοῦ μηδὲν ἔχειν πέρας ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης. φροντίζω Frag. 150 φροντιεῖν τοῦ μηδὲν ἀδίκημα ποίησειν τὸν Προυσίαν. προνοέομαι 12, 25k, 6 ὅτι προνοηθεῖεν τοῦ μὴ βουλευέσθαι τὰ πλήθη. But πρόνοιαν ποιοῦμαι is commoner than προνοέομαι with the articular infin., and occurs so in classical prose, e. g. Demosth. 47, 80, which προνοέομαι does not.

μετέχω 23, 16, 13 ὅσοι μετέσχον τοῦ—ἐπανελέσθαι τὸν Φιλοποιμένα. ἐγγεύομαι "taste of" 7, 13, 7 ἐγγενεσάμενος αἵματος καὶ τοῦ φονεύειν. κρατεῖν 10, 23, 9 εἰ κρατοῦσιν οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ σαφῶς καὶ δεόντως διδόναι τὰ παραγγέλματα: 'if they know how to.' See Schweigh.'s note comparing 39, 12, 4 κατεκράτησε τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου. 4, 82, 8 κατεκράτησε τοῦ γενέσθαι στρατηγὸν Ἐπήρατον: "obtinuit ut." So 28, 13, 13. στοχάζομαι 4, 19, 10 στοχάζόμενοι τοῦ δοκεῖν μόνον, and 21, 28, 9. Compare Aristot. Eth. N. 4, 8, 3 στοχάζομαι τοῦ ἡδὺς εἶναι, and Dion. H. de Isoc. §2, p. 538, 13 καὶ τοῦ γλαφυρῶς λέγειν στοχάζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἀφελῶς.

16, 3, 12 αὐτὸς ἤμαρτε τοῦ τρῶσαι. 3, 63, 12 οὐδέποτε διεψεύσθαι τοῦ κρατεῖν τῶν ἀντιταξαμένων. 5, 4, 10 διατρέπω. 13, 3, 2 τοσοῦτον ἀπηλλοτριοῦντο τοῦ κακομηχανεῖν. 2, 37, 11 διαλλάττει 'differt.' 3, 32, 10 ὅσον τὸ μαθεῖν διαφέρει τοῦ μόνον ἀκοῦσαι. And so 16, 16, 4.

στερέομαι 23, 10, 10 τοῦ ζῆν ἐστερήθησαν. 11, 30, 3 ἀπηλλαγμένοι τοῦ ζῆν. Compare Isocr. 3, 6 οὐ μόνον τοῦ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἀπηλλάγμεν. ἀποδειλιάω "shrink from" 4, 11, 4 τοῦ μὲν ἐγχειρεῖν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις ἀπεδειλίασεν. The only instance in classical Greek of this construction appears to be Xen. Lac. R. 10, 7, quoted by Weiske, p. 500; a parallel which renders unnecessary Schweighäuser's suggestion τὸ μὲν ἐγχειρεῖν, upon which, however, he does not insist. ἀπελπίζω has

¹ If ἀφέντα τοῦ, in 18, 3, 3, is to be corrected, either παρέντα γὰρ τὸ κατὰ κ. τ. λ. or ἀφέντος γὰρ τοῦ κατὰ κ. τ. λ. would avoid the objections to ἀφέντα τοῦ, and of the two ἀφέντος is perhaps the more probable, and might have been corrupted by confusion with the φεύγοντα in the following line.

τοῦ ζῆν 15, 10, 7, but the simple infinitive 9, 6, 8 (*ἀπελπίζοντες αἰρήσειν*) and 16, 30, 5. For the genitive compare Diod. 11, 38, 3 τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελπίσας, but ἀπελπίσαι τὸ ζῆν Diod. 17, 106, 7. See Goetzeler, de Pol. eloc. p. 23.

ἄρχομαι 'begin' 9, 32, 2 ἤρξατο τοῦ λέγειν, but with the simple infinitive in 16, 11, 2, where, however, Schweighäuser defends πολιιορκῶν.

9, 12, 8 προσδεῖσθαι τοῦ λαθεῖν. λείπειν 2, 14, 6. 10, 17, 12 λείπει βραχὺ τι τοῦ διπλασίους εἶναι. 12, 18, 5 λείπει βραχὺ τοῦ ἐπάλληλον εἶναι.

παρ' οὐδὲν (ὀλίγον, μικρὸν) ἐλθεῖν τοῦ c. inf. For this construction see Kälker, pp. 254 and 302; Krebs, Präp. b. P. p. 56; Goetzeler, p. 25. The cases are these: 1, 45, 14 παρ' οὐδὲν ἐλθόντες τοῦ πάσας ἀποβαλεῖν τὰς παρασκευάς, ἐκράτησαν. 2, 55, 4 παρ' ὀλίγον ἐλθεῖν τοῦ μὴ μόνον ἐκπεσεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ κινδυνεύσαι. 11, 7, 1 παρὰ μικρὸν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ λαβεῖν τὸν Ἀτταλον ὑποχείριον. and 10, 12, 11. 18, 19, 6. 30, 1, 5. 33, 3, 1. In the first two of these examples Cobet proposes to omit τοῦ, but the construction with τοῦ is too frequent to be so treated. The simple infinitive occurs in 1, 43, 7. 33, 1, 4, in both of which τοῦ is omitted to avoid a hiatus (Kälker, p. 254), and in 12, 20, 7; but the construction with τοῦ is paralleled by Diodor. 17, 42, 4 (Krebs, p. 57), and by C. I. G. 4896 C. 11, 12 (Kälker, p. 302).

In 6, 41, 1 ὅταν ἐγγίῳσι *τοῦ στρατοπεδεύειν, τοῦ was added by Schweigh., but Krebs, P.-A. II 52, has a very plausible emendation ὅταν ἔλθωσιν ἔγγυς τοῦ στρατοπεδεύειν.

Many of the above constructions with verbs are classical, and the rest follow mostly classical analogies. παρ' οὐδὲν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ c. inf. is the only noticeable novelty. For the classical parallels see Weiske, pp. 499-501.

2. With nouns.

Polybius follows classical precedent in his use of the genitive of the articular infinitive with nouns and adjectives. The construction of the art. inf. had already become established as a handy syntactical implement, and it is purely due to chance if a substantive takes the genitive of the infinitive in Polybius which is not found in a similar construction in classical authors. The only phrase which recurs with a frequency that stamps it as a characteristic is ἐλπίς τοῦ c. inf., which is found 16 times with τοῦ νικᾶν and similar expressions. αἴτιος τοῦ c. inf., which occurs 13 times in Polybius, was already a favorite of all the classical prose-writers except Thucydides.

After many nouns in classical prose the genitive of the articular infin. varies with the simple infinitive without the article, a variation dependent on the taste of the author (Birklein, p. 101). Thucydides, for example, consistently joins *αἴτιος* with the simple infinitive (Birklein, p. 53), while other writers show a preference for τοῦ c. inf. after *αἴτιος*.

A similar variety is found in Polybius. In the case of *αἴτιος* and *ἐλπίς* he prefers the genitive of the articular inf., but in other cases we often find both constructions side by side. Thus the genitive of the art. inf. is found with *ἐξουσία* in 9, 36, 10 δι' οὗς ἔχετε τοῦ νῦν βουλευέσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν: 3, 29, 7 and 23, 14, 3, but the simple infinitive is found 15, 26a, 1 ἐξουσίαν ἔσχε μνηῦσαι τὴν πρᾶξιν. 5, 56, 8 and 32, 8, 7.

ἔννοιαν λαμβάνειν 15, 1, 12 μὴ μόνον τοῦ νικᾶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σφαλῆναι πάλιν, but with the simple infin. Frag. 153 εἰς ἔννοιαν ἦλθε τὴν φρουρὰν ἀποτρίψασθαι.

ἐπιβολή 5, 62, 7 τοῦ μὲν ἐκ χειρὸς βοηθεῖν οὐδ' ἐπιβολὴν εἶχον. Compare Thuc. 5, 9, 6 τοῦ ἀπιέναι—τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχειν. But in Pol. 2, 11, 2 τὴν πρώτην ἐπιβολὴν ἔσχε πλεῖν ὁ Γναῖος ἐπὶ τῆς Κερκύρας, where πλεῖν is Reiske's correction of πλείον.

ὁρμή 15, 5, 8 εἰς ὁρμὴν ἔπεσε τοῦ βούλεσθαι συνελθεῖν, but in 6, 44, 4 ὁρμὴ παραστῇ τοῖς ἐπιβάταις συμφρονεῖν.

σημεῖον 28, 17, 12 σημεῖον τοῦ δεδιέναι τὴν περίστασιν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. But 12, 6b, 3 οὐδὲν ἐστὶ σημεῖον ψευδῇ λέγειν τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην. Hence Hultsch's correction is not called for in 23, 13, 1 μέγιστον σημεῖον γεγονέναι τῇ φύσει ἡγεμονικόν, where he supplies τοῦ before γεγονέναι.

Except *ἔννοια* and *ἐπιβολή* these nouns had all occurred in the construction with τοῦ c. inf. before Polybius, and the following also are classical phrases. See Weiske, pp. 497–8.

ἐλπίς occurs 16 times in Polybius with τοῦ c. inf., six times in the phrase ἡ ἐλπίς or αἱ ἐλπίδες τοῦ νικᾶν. The tense following it is noticeable; the future occurs twice, the aorist only once.

(a) With present tense: 1, 49, 10 τῆς τοῦ νικᾶν ἐλπίδα, 3, 64, 3. 15, 11, 7. τὰς τοῦ νικᾶν ἐλπίδας 1, 62, 4. 16, 19, 10. 32, 2. τὴν τοῦ ζῆν ἐλπίδα 3, 63, 10. 6, 9, 8. τοῦ δύνασθαι 2, 51, 2. 63, 2. and 4, 32, 10. And in 15, 25, 29. 37, 1, 10.

(b) Future tense: 3, 48, 2 τὰς μεγίστας ἐλπίδας ἔχων τοῦ κατορθώσιν τοῖς ὅλοις. 7, 15, 4 μίαν ταύτην ἔχοντας ἐλπίδα τοῦ κρατήσιν τῆς πόλεως.

(c) Aorist: 3, 17, 5 παρελίσθαι Ῥωμαίων τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ συστήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον.

αἰτία 4, 39, 7 and 11. 41, 3. 11, 25, 2. 18, 31, 1. 23, 2, 6. 33, 1, 5 τὴν αἰτίαν ἔσχε τοῦ μὴ συντελεσθῆναι τὴν ἀπόλυσιν. And in 2, 38, 9 Hultsch² adopts the correction αἰτίαν for αἷτιον: ταύτην ἀρχηγὸν καὶ αἰτίαν ἡγητέον τοῦ—καταστήσασθαι. This correction rests on the parallel of 2, 21, 8.

15, 34, 5 ἀδυναμία τοῦ βασιλεύειν 'incapacity for.' 22, 8, 8 ἀρχαὶ πρόδηλοι τοῦ συστάντος Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Περσέϊ πολέμον καὶ τοῦ καταλυθῆναι τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχήν. 3, 69, 8 ἀφορμὴ τοῦ πράττειν τι. 1, 1, 2 διδάσκαλος τοῦ δύνασθαι—ὑποφέρειν. 6, 35, 12 and 36, 5 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται τοῦ κατὰ φιλακὴν βουκανῶν. καιρός 1, 62, 6 τὸν τε τοῦ νικᾶν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν τοῦ λείπεσθαι καιρόν. 5, 98, 5 τοῦ πράττειν, 10, 19, 5 and 36, 5, 2.

λόγον ἔχειν 18, 15, 15 τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, δοκοῦν πανουργότατον εἶναι τῶν ζώων, πολλὸν ἔχει λόγον τοῦ φαυλότατον ὑπάρχειν. "Multa tamen dici posse cur stolidissimum habeatur": Schweigh. 5, 111, 7 καλὸν παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινόμενοις ἀπέλιπε τοῦ μὴ ῥαδίαν ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης βαρβάρους τὴν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διάβασιν. 1, 22, 8 παρασκευὴ τοῦ ναυμαχεῖν. Frag. 76 τοῦ λέγειν ἀληθινῶς ταῦτα πίστις.

πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι τοῦ c. inf.; cf. Demosth. 47, 80. Pol. 23, 17, 3 πρόνοιαν πεποιήναι τοῦ μηθένα εἰσάγειν. 36, 8, 4. Frag. 157.

The genit. of the art. inf. after πρόνοιαν εἶχε is also restored with probability by Schweigh. in 11, 2. 10 οὐχ ἦττον πρόνοιαν εἶχε καὶ τοῦ σφαλῆναι τοῖς ὅλοις ὁμόσε χωρῆσαι τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ μηδὲν ὑπομῆναι τῶν προβεβιωμένων ἀνάξιον. For καίτοι of the MSS Casaubon proposed τοῦ and Schweigh. καὶ τοῦ. ὁμόσε χωρῆσαι is also a correction for ὁμωσ ἐχώρησε.

πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι is also joined by Polybius with περὶ τοῦ c. inf. (11, 31, 7) and ὑπὲρ τοῦ c. inf. (3, 87, 5. 5, 10, 7); cf. Krebs, pp. 42, 100. πρόφασις 3, 108, 5 πρόφασις τοῦ μὴ νικᾶν τοὺς ἐχθρούς, and 4, 17, 10. τέλος 4, 57, 11. χρόνος 3, 112, 5 ὁ τοῦ μέλλειν χρόνος.

The following nouns occur in Polybius for the first time in this construction:

2, 40, 2 βεβαιώτην τοῦ μόνιμον αὐτὴν γενέσθαι Λυκόρταν ἡγητέον. Frag. 112 τοῦ μνησικακεῖν οὐδ' ἡντινοῦν ἔμφασιν ἐποίουν. καταρχή 15, 33, 1. τὴν κυρίαν ἔχειν 6, 15, 6. πείρα 8, 9, 6 τοῦ πολιορκεῖν πείραν λαβεῖν. συνηθία 2, 20, 8 συνήθεια τοῦ κατακόπτεσθαι. 4, 76, 6 συνήθεια τοῦ μηδὲν ἡγεῖσθαι δεινόν. σύνθημα 8, 27, 3 ἐποίησαντο σύνθημα τοῦ παραδέχεσθαι σφᾶς τοὺς φύλακας: "They made an agreement that the guards should admit them." Cf. Dem. 56, 1. τὴν ὁμολογίαν τοῦ ποιήσκειν τὰ δίκαια. πρόληψις 16, 32, 4 (The men of Abydos preferred death) μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶντες ἔτι πρόληψιν ἔχειν τοῦ πεσεῖσθαι τὰ σφέτερα τέκνα ὑπὸ τὴν τῶν πολεμίων ἐξουσίαν. παράπτωσις 12, 25k, 10 χωρὶς τῆς

δλης παραπτώσεως τοῦ διατεθεῖσθαι: an instance of the epexegetical genitive 'the mistake consisting in.' Compare the same construction with ἀμαθία, Plato Apol. 29B (Weiske).

3. After Adjectives:

αἴτιος: τοῦ c. inf. is very common in classical prose after αἴτιος; see Weiske, p. 501. It is frequent in Polybius, e. g. 1, 40, 16 αἴτιος ἰδόκει γεγονέναι τοῦ πάλιν ἀναβαρρῆσαι. 9, 3, 9 τὸ παρ' Ἀννίβου σύνταγμα αἴτιον ἦν καὶ τοῦ κικᾶν τοὺς Καρχηδονίους καὶ τοῦ λείπεσθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. And 1, 43, 8. 57, 7. 12, 25k, 6. 13, 4, 8. 15, 33, 6. 21, 13, 10. 23, 14, 6. 24, 11, 1. 27, 15, 2. In frag. 184 αἴτιοι τοῦ is restored with great probability by Hultsch's emendation of τῷ. See under the dative. ἀλλότριος 21, 11, 2. ἐμπόδιος 18, 22, 4. ἀπειρος τοῦ νεῖν 39, 9, 12. κύριος 29, 9, 9.

4. Genitive of Price. See Lammert, Fleck. Jahrb. 1888, p. 621; Madvig, Syntax, §65b.

In Polybius occurs the first instance of the genitive of the art. inf. used as a genitive of price. 3, 96, 12 λαβὼν παρ' αὐτῶν χρήματα τοῦ μὴ πορθῆσαι τὴν χώραν, ἀπηλλάγη. 29, 8, 5 ὁ μὲν γὰρ Εὐμένης ἦτει τοῦ (MSS τὸ) μὲν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν καὶ μὴ συστρατεῦσαι Ῥωμαίους μήτε κατὰ γῆν μήτε κατὰ θάλατταν πεντακόσια τάλαντα, τοῦ δὲ διαλύσαι τὸν πόλεμον χίλια πεντακόσια κ. τ. λ. Compare §7 αἰσχροὺς εἶναι τὸ δοκεῖν μισθοῦ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν.

5. Final Genitive.

The use of the articular infinitive in the genitive to express purpose (and sometimes result) is remarkable as being the only case-construction which is peculiar to the articular infinitive and not shared with it by substantives. Birklein, p. 55, enumerates the different theories of its origin and gives his support to that propounded by Kviczala (Wiener Studien, I, p. 239), by whom this genitive is connected with the Latin absolute genitive of the gerundive. According to this view, from denoting the sphere to which anything belongs, the genitive of the articular infin. or the gerundive comes to be used attributively with substantives and then in free relation to verbs and a whole sentence.

In classical authors the usage is never a common one. Thucydides, with whom the final genitive first occurs, employs it oftener (proportionally) than the other classical prosaists, and usually with the negative; τοῦ μὴ c. inf. occurring 10 times, τοῦ without μὴ only twice. In all, there are 33 instances in Thuc., Demosth., Lysias, Plato and Xenophon, of which 8 only are affirmative. See Birklein, p. 102; Weiske, p. 502. As expressions of purpose

with the articular infin. other constructions were preferred to the genitive by classical authors, Thucydides excepted, *ἐνεκα τοῦ* and *ἐπὶ τῷ* being favored by Demosthenes, *ἐνεκα τοῦ* by Plato and Xenophon, while Isocrates used *ὑπὲρ τοῦ* exclusively. With Polybius, the final genitive occurs 11 times, but is only one among several expressions of purpose with the articular infinitive; the others being *πρὸς τὸ*, *εἰς τὸ*, *ἐπὶ τῷ*, *ἐνεκα τοῦ*, and *χάριν τοῦ* c. infin., of which the last, with 78 occurrences, is the favorite. The negative is found with the final genitive in every case but one; *τοῦ μὴ* c. inf. occurs 1, 12, 6. 2, 34, 1. 4, 18, 11. 5, 31, 3. 102, 6. 7, 16, 7. 9, 36, 1. 18, 35, 3. 21, 25, 7. 28, 8, 6, and the only affirmative instance is 12, 28a, 2.

Before discussing these cases mention should be made of the ingenious but unsuccessful attempt of E. Lammert, Fleck. Jhb. 1888, p. 617, to remove every instance of the final genitive of the art. inf. from Polybius. In all the above-quoted cases except 9, 36, 1 and 21, 25, 7, which he omits to notice, L. gets rid of final *τοῦ* c. inf. by alteration of the text, generally by inserting *χάριν*. He suspects the final use in Polybius *a priori* from the preponderance of *χάριν* in final clauses, the preference of Polybius for prepositional constructions, and the rare use of final *τοῦ* c. inf. in classical Greek. In doing so, however, he fails to take into account the other final uses of the art. inf. in Polybius besides *χάριν τοῦ* c. inf., and understates the frequency of the final genitive in classical prose. In reality the final *τοῦ* c. inf. passages in Polybius are too many to admit of the shadow of a doubt of their genuineness.

In 5, 102, 6 καὶ συνυποκριθεὶς ὡς ἐμβάλων εἰς τὴν Ἡλείαν τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν λίαν ἔτοιμος εἶναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πολέμου κατάλυσιν, μετὰ ταῦτα κ. τ. λ., relying on the analogy of 8, 26, 6 κατηγορίας ποιούμενοι χάριν τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν, and 14, 2, 12 τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἐποίησατο χάριν τοῦ μὴ δόξαι παρασπονδεῖν, Lammert thinks that *χάριν* should be inserted before *τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν*. And against each of the several instances of final *τοῦ* c. inf. in Polybius he employs similar arguments drawn from Polybius' phraseology in other passages. 'At vero,' as Hultsch asks in his Praef. xxx, 'ex ullo dicendi usu vel frequentissimo quem nos recentiores in aliquo scriptore antiquo observavimus, effici posse, ut ille omnibus eius generis locis eundem usum unice amplexus nihil praeterea, quod et apte diceretur et ornate, admiserit, quis est qui contendat?' In this particular case, as it happens, we can point to another passage, which L. has overlooked, where the same phrase *τοῦ μὴ δόξαι* is found in the final

sense: 9, 36, 1 *περὶ δὲ τῶν κατ' Ἀντίγονον ἕως τούτου βούλομαι ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην* [ἕως] τοῦ μὴ δόξαι καταφρονεῖν τῶν γεγονότων. In spite of Kälker (p. 274) and Stich (p. 210), who defend the text, there can here be no doubt that Hultsch is right in bracketing the second *ἕως* as spurious. The sense requires a final clause to follow *ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην*, and *ἕως τοῦ* cannot stand; and for final clauses following *τὴν μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* compare 1, 20, 8. 2, 71, 4. 3, 7, 4 with *χάριν*, and 2, 35, 6 with *ἵνα*. Assuming, on the other hand, the original reading to have been: *ἕως τούτου βούλομαι ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην, τοῦ μὴ δόξαι κ. τ. λ.*, we see how easily a scribe to whom the final genitive was unfamiliar would regard τοῦ μὴ δόξαι as in apposition to *ἕως τούτου* and would be led to supply *ἕως* before τοῦ. In this way the passage provides us with a powerful argument against Lammert, for the presence of the spurious *ἕως* before the final genitive shows that *χάριν* can never have stood there. Hultsch is followed by Krebs P-A., I, p. 52, and Götzeler, p. 26. See Hultsch, Fleck. Jahrb. 1884, p. 477.

18, 35, 3 *μαρτυρίας δὲ χάριν ὁμολογούμενα δὴ ὀνόματα . . . τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀδόνατα λέγειν*. Δεύκιος μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ. Here τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν also occurs, after a lacuna which is by Reiske filled up with *παράθῃσθαι* or *παρέξομαι*.¹ 1, 12, 6 *ἐποιησάμεθα τὴν ἐπίστασιν, ἀναδραμόντες ἔτι τοῖς χρόνοις, τοῦ μηδὲν ἀπόρημα καταλιπεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποδείξεων*. Here L. inserts *χάριν* on the analogy of 37, 9, 7 *χάριν τοῦ καταλιπεῖν*.

28, 8, 6 *ὁ Γένθιος οὐκ ἐδόκει μὲν ἀλλότριος εἶναι τῆς φιλίας, ἐσκήπτετο δὲ τοῦ μὴ παραχρῆμα συγκατατίθεσθαι τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις τὴν ἀχορηγησίαν καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι χωρὶς χρημάτων ἀναδέξασθαι τὸν πόλεμον*. Lammert in inserting *χάριν* before τοῦ μὴ in this passage, quotes, it is true, the following, where *χάριν τοῦ* c. inf. follows *σκήπτομαι* or a phrase of similar import: 39, 12, 11. 8, 28, 1. 5, 74, 9. 18, 11, 8. On the other hand, we find after *συνυποκριθεὶς* final τοῦ c. inf. in 5, 102, 6; after *οὐκ ἠπόρουν*

¹ Lammert's proposal here is very ingenious but hardly probable; comparing 6, 54, 6 he inserts a line and reads:

*μαρτυρίας δὲ χάριν [καὶ]
τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀδόνατα
λέγειν, ὁμολογούμενα δὴ
<ἀρκοῦντ' ἔσται ῥηθέντ'>
ὀνόματα κ. τ. λ.*

To support this emendation parallels from Polybius are wanted of *ἀρκοῦν ἔστι* used absolutely; in the passage L. quotes 6, 54, 6, and in 2, 56, 5 it is followed by *πρός*.

σκήψεων have πρὸς τὸ c. inf. in 3, 68, 9, and 29, 24, 3 σκήψιν οὖσαν πρὸς τὸ διακωλύσαι.¹

7, 16. 7 τοῦ δὲ μὴ γενέσθαι μηδεμίαν ὑποψίαν τῆς ἀληθείας διέδωκε λόγον κ. τ. λ. L. here quotes χάριν τοῦ γενέσθαι in 5, 88, 6. 38, 9, 2. He has a much more complicated proposal in 5, 31, 3 and 4 αἰρουμένοι δὲ τοιαύτην ἐπίστασιν καὶ διαίρεσιν τῆς ἐνεστώσης διηγήσεως· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ τῆς τῶν κατὰ μέρος καιρῶν ἀκρίβειας διαμαρτάνειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἱκανὴν τοῖς φιλομαθοῦσι πεπείσμεθα παρασκευάζειν ἐμπειρίαν ἐκ τοῦ—παρνομιμνήσκειν. τὸ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον γίνεσθαι κ. τ. λ. For the first of these two clauses, τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ διαμαρτάνειν, compare 3, 21, 9 ἡμῖν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι δοκεῖ τὸ μὴ παραλιπεῖν ἄσκεπτον τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ἵνα μήτε, οἷς καθήκει καὶ διαφέρει τὸ σαφῶς εἰδέναι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, παραπαίωσι τῆς ἀληθείας—μήθ' οἱ φιλομαθοῦντες ἀστοχῶσι. And for the second clause, τὸ δ' εὐπαρακ. κ. τ. λ., see under the accusative. For Lammert's proposal see his paper, p. 621.

21, 25, 7 ἀπήγαγε τὴν στρατιὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, δοκῶν ἡσφαλίσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἰτωλίαν τοῖς προειρημένοις ἔθνεσι καὶ τόποις τοῦ μηδένα δύνασθαι κακοποιεῖν τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. This is an instance of final τοῦ c. inf. which has escaped Lammert's clutches, and there are no parallel cases of χάριν to favor the supposition of its having dropped out here.

4, 18, 11 οἱ δὲ Λουσιᾶται νουνεχῶς δόντες τινὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων τῆς θεοῦ, παρητήσαντο τὴν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀσέβειαν [καὶ] τοῦ μηδὲν παθεῖν ἀνέκασθαι. καὶ is read in the MSS, but is marked as suspicious by the 'prima manus' of the Vatican; and Hultsch brackets καὶ, and is followed by Krebs P-A, I 53 note. See Hultsch, Fleck. Jahr. 1884, p. 744. Lammert suggests that καὶ is a corruption of ἐνεκα, or that a whole line has been lost.

2, 34, 1 ἔσπευσαν οἱ κατασταθέντες ὕπατοι Μάρκος Κλαύδιος καὶ Γναῖος Κορνήλιος τοῦ μὴ συγχωρηθῆναι τὴν εἰρήνην αὐτοῖς.

Lammert makes out what is *prima facie* a strong case against the genuineness of final τοῦ c. inf. in this passage. He attacks it on the ground that σπεύδω and σπουδάζω are never used absolutely in Polybius, but are found either with an infinitive, or with a prepositional phrase like ὑπὲρ or περὶ τούτου τοῦ μέρους followed by a final sentence with ἵνα or ὥς (cf. 4, 51, 2. 5, 104, 9, etc.), or with ὑπὲρ τοῦ, περὶ τοῦ c. inf., as in 16, 17, 10. 22, 4, 4. This statement of usage is not quite correct. σπεύδω is, it is true, regularly joined with the simple infinitive in Polybius, but I have found no passage except

¹ Götzelor, p. 25, mistakes the final genitive in 28, 8, 6 for a genitive governed by σκήπτομαι, which would be unique.

the one L. quotes (4, 51, 2) where σπεύδω is used with ὑπὲρ or περὶ τούτου—ἵνα. In the other passages quoted by L. σπουδάζω is the verb, and where the question is purely one of usage, cases of σπουδάζω cannot be quoted to support a rule as to σπεύδω. Further, σπεύδω is never in Polybius joined like σπουδάζω with ὑπὲρ or περὶ τοῦ c. inf., so that there is no support from Polybius' usage for one of L.'s suggestions here, namely, to read ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ. Lastly, it is incorrect to say that σπεύδω is never used absolutely in Polybius; cf. 3, 78, 5 σπεύδοντας δὲ καὶ μετεώρους ὄντας εἰς τὴν πολεμίαν. 3, 92, 5 Φάβιος δὲ μεχρὶ μὲν τοῦ συνάψαι τοῖς τόποις ἔσπευδε. 3, 92, 4 σπεύδειν ᾔοντο δεῖν καὶ συνάπτειν εἰς τὰ πῆδια. Thus there is no reason why σπεύδω should not be absolute here, with a final τοῦ c. inf., for in classical Greek σπεύδω may be so used with ἵνα and the subjunctive. Plato Polit. 264a; Isocr. 75a.¹

In 12, 28a, 3 Lammert's case against final τοῦ c. inf. is much completer than in the other instances. It appears that ὑπομένειν τι is always joined by Polybius with χάριν τοῦ c. inf., and so L. inserts χάριν here: αὐτὸς γοῦν τηλικαύτην ὑπομεμενηκῆναι δαπάνην καὶ κακοπάθειαν τοῦ συνάγειν τὰ ὑπομνήματα. He compares 18, 46, 14 πᾶσαν ὑπομῆναι δαπάνην καὶ πάντα κίνδυνον χάριν τῆς ἐλευθερίας. And πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ c. inf. he quotes from 1, 48, 9. 4, 31, 3. 6, 54, 3. 52, 11. 29, 9, 12 (to which add 21, 33, 7 πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τῆς ἐλευθερίας). τὰλλα ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ c. inf. 6, 42, 5. And 29, 7, 4 πᾶν τι ἐπιδεχομένων χάριν τοῦ τὸν πόλεμον διαλύσασθαι. In 1, 31, 8. 4, 76, 7 where ἐφ' ᾧ c. inf. follows ὑπομένειν, it is in reality dependent upon πείραν λαμβάνειν, which, as 27, 15, 15 shows, Polybius is fond of joining with ἐφ' ᾧ c. inf. In this case there is some probability in Lammert's conjecture χάριν τοῦ, particularly as τοῦ συνάγειν is the only instance of the affirmative final genitive in Polybius, all the others being instances of τοῦ μὴ c. inf.²

¹ Stich (de P. dicendi genere, p. 154) and Kälker, p. 283, are not justified in assuming that σπεύδω here governs a genitive of the art. inf., as ἐφίεμαι, ὀρέγομαι, etc., for in that case we should expect to find the same construction with substantives, which we do not.

² In two corrupt passages final τοῦ c. inf. has been proposed: 10, 46, 3 τὸ δὲ βάθος (παραπεφράχθαι δεῖ) ὡς ἀνδρόμηκες, τὸ τοὺς πυρσούς αἰρομένους μὲν παρὰ ταῦτα τὴν φάσιν ἀκριβῆ ποιεῖν, καθαιρουμένους δὲ τὴν κρύψιν. Here for τὸ Hultsch reads τοῦ and Krebs (P-A, I 53, note 1) supports him. Casaubon proposed εἰς τὸ, Dindorf εἰς τὸ, and this is the more likely. See under εἰς τὸ c. inf.

4, 74, 8 οὐδέποτε πρότερον εἰδυεστέραν διάθεσιν ἐσχῆκε τῆς νῦν . . . παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογουμένην κτήσασθαι τὴν ἀσυλίαν. Here Casaubon added πρὸς τὸ after τῆς νῦν; but Scaliger proposed τοῦ, which Krebs l. c. prefers. Hultsch is,

For the later history of final τοῦ c. inf. see Krebs, P-A, I 54; it occurs with great frequency in the Septuagint and the New Testament.

6. Comparative Genitive.

The genitive of the infinitive after a comparative is frequent in classical authors, especially in Xen., Plato and Demosth. See Weiske, p. 501; Birklein, pp. 78, 88. In Polybius it occurs 15 times, in 7 of which the comparative is negated. 2, 7, 10 οὐδὲν προυργιαίτερον ἐποιήσατο τοῦ—ἐμβαλεῖν. Thus, too, after οὐδὲν προυργιαίτερον ποιείσθαι in 4, 66, 2. 8, 27, 6. προυργιαίτερον 29, 9, 7. οὐδὲν ἀναγκαϊότερον 5, 31, 4. 8, 34, 4. οὐδὲν αἰσχίον 6, 56, 2. περὶ πλείονος ποιείσθαι 18, 53, 3. And 2, 61, 3. 3, 8, 10. 81, 1. 111, 2. 9, 14, 10. 30, 7, 8.

In 2, 64, 6 οὐδὲν περὶ πλείονος ποιούμενος τοῦ κατὰ λόγον *χρήσασθαι *τοῖς πράγμασιν, the MSS give τὸν κατὰ λόγον πράγμασιν A¹, τοῖς κ. λ. πρ. A¹R. The alteration τοῦ, and the addition of χρήσασθαι τοῖς is due to Schweigh. and adopted by Hultsch (q. v.) It is supported by the numerous cases quoted above of a negated comparative with τοῦ c. inf.; but Krebs' proposal τοῦ κατὰ λόγον χειρισμοῦ τῶν πραγμάτων is attractive (Präp. bei P., p. 140).

7. Genitive Absolute.

τοῦ c. inf. as subject in the genitive absolute is never common, and though it occurs but 7 times in Polybius it is more frequent with him than with any of the Attics; see Weiske, p. 502. 1, 60, 1 παρὰ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν προσπεσόντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ πεπλευκέναι στόλῳ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. 6, 24, 7 ἀδήλου γὰρ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν τι τὸν ἡγεμόνα. 18, 34, 7 ἤδη γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῆς δωροδοκίας ἐπιπολαζούσης καὶ τοῦ μηδένα μηδὲν δωρεὰν πράττειν. And 10, 36, 1. 12, 6, 4. 15, 30, 7.¹

E. G. W. HEWLETT.

however, right in following Casaubon, not because the negative is absent here also, but because πρὸς is the correct expression after εὐφύης. See below under πρὸς.

¹ Kälker, p. 253, notes that, fond as Polybius was of the articular infinitive, 'ne huic quidem usui ita indulsit, ut hiatum admitteret'; and compares 1, 60, 1 (quoted above) with 3, 40, 2 προσπεσόντος Ἀννίβαν διαβεβηκέναι. But with προσπεσόντος the simple infinitive is the usual construction; see Götzeler's list, p. 26, from which it appears that the simple infinitive occurs, e. g. 5, 62, 4 προσπεσόντος αὐτῷ τὸν μὲν Πτολεμαῖον ἐξεληλυθέναι, and 2, 54, 10. 5, 46, 5. 7, 3, 7. 10, 42, 1, in all of which τοῦ might have stood without causing a hiatus. On this point of avoidance of hiatus see below under πρὸς, and Büttner-Wobst, Fleck. Jahrb. 1884, p. 115.

II.—THE ACCUSATIVE PLURAL OF *ī*-, *u*-, AND *r*-STEMS IN SANSKRIT AND AVESTAN.

Some months since, while reading the *Yasna Haptanghāiti* in Geldner's new edition of the *Avesta*, I noted the two acc. plur. forms which are now, on the authority of the best MSS, read *māterāš* (Y. 38, 5) and *nerāš* (Y. 40, 3) with final *š*, not *s*, and was struck with the importance of the new reading for determining the Aryan form. Soon after I found that Bartholomae (K. Z. 29, 483) had already made these forms the starting point of an article in which he retracts the explanation which he had once given on the basis of the reading *neras* (*Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekten*, §205), and substitutes a new treatment of the acc. plur. of *ī*-, *u*-, and *r*-stems. His theory has awakened the strong hostility of J. Schmidt in *Pluralbildung der indogerm. Neutra*, and a review of the subject with an attempt at a somewhat different explanation may not be superfluous.

According to Bartholomae, the coincidence of the Sanskrit and Avestan forms proves that the Aryan¹ accusatives plural were *-inš*, *-unš*, *-rns*,² and since the intervening nasal would prevent the change of *s* to *š* after *i*, *u*, and *r*, the *š* in place of *s* must be due to analogy. So he thinks that *-ins*, *-uns* became *-inš*, *-uns* under the influence of the fem. acc. plur. *-iš*, *-ūš* after the analogy of *ans* : *ās*, and that after this the *š* spread even to the *r*-stems.

J. Schmidt (*Pluralbildung*, pg. 273 ff.) denies that the Aryan forms can have been *-inš*, *-unš*, not being able to accept Bartholomae's explanation, because (1) the existence of Aryan acc. plur. fem. in *-īs*, *-ūš* doubtful, Skt. *-īs*, *-ūs* probably new formations masc. *-īn*, *-ūn* on the analogy of *-ās* : *-ān*; (2) Skt. *girīn*, etc., with dental *n* cannot be derived from an Aryan *-inš*: "Ehe die nasale vor folgenden zischlauten zu anusvāra wurden, hatten sie die selbe artikulationstelle wie die zischlaute . . . Das beweisen fälle wie *dān(s)*, gen. zu *dam-*, *agan(s)* du giengst, *avān(st)* er verbeugte sich. Ar.**girīnsh* hätte also *girīn*, nicht *girīn* ergeben." This last objection

¹ It is perhaps scarcely necessary to state that Aryan is used in the sense of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family.

² In reference to the length of the vowels, cf. the excursus at end.

has been answered, satisfactorily as it seems to me,¹ by Bartholomae himself (*Indogermanisch* ss, pg. 38), and on the first no very great weight can be laid. But even admitting the justice of J. Schmidt's strictures, as far as they concern Bartholomae's explanation, he is certainly unreasonable in denying the actual existence of Aryan forms with final *ś*. As we shall see, the acceptance of these forms does not necessarily imply that *-inś* is the direct predecessor of Skt. *in*. He admits that the Vedic Sandhi forms in *-inr*, *-unr* before vowels can be derived only from forms in *z*, not *z*, but considers these a special Skt. formation with transfer of the *z* from the fem. The Av. forms in *-iš*, *-uš* he holds to be either

¹ Notwithstanding the retort made (since the above was written) by J. Schmidt in his lectures on Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit. At the close of some observations intended expressly to enlighten "the gentlemen who come from Leipzig" as to his reasons for still writing *agni-s*, etc., with dental, not lingual final, he reproduces as his best point the argument that an Aryan *-inś* would give Skt. *-in*, not *-in*, and derisively adds, "Bartholomae will diesen entwand beseitigen, indem er sagt, wir wissen nicht wie früh sich die linguale Artikulation in Sanskrit eingestellt hat. Na, dann ist, überhaupt keiner Streit mehr," implying that Bartholomae was thus receding from his own position that the Aryan form had *ś*, not *s*. Such an implication can have force only for one who is laboring under a delusion referred to by Sievers (*Grundzüge der Phonetik*², pg. 122) as follows: "Hier gibt es vor allen Dingen den aus der Sanskrit-grammatik bei vielen Sprachforschern eingewurzelten Irrthum zu beseitigen, als sei 'cerebrales s' ohne weiteres identisch mit *ś*, oder 'palatales s' mit skr. *ç*, d. h. als verhielten sich die drei Laute *ś*, *ç*, *s* so zu einander wie die skr. verschlusslaute *ṭ*, *c*, *t*. Vielmehr existiren vollkommen ausgebildete Parallelreihen von *s*- und *ś*-Lauten, d. h. es giebt sowohl cerebrale, palatale als dentale *s* und *ś*." The old transcription of the Skt. sound in question, and still used by J. Schmidt, namely, *sh*, emphasizes the fact that it is an *sh*-sound, Whitney's transcription, which I have followed in this paper, *ṣ*, the fact that it is a lingual sound. While either of these is for practical use better than a more complicated designation, the only strictly correct transcription is that used by Brugmann in his *Grundriss*, *ṣ*, which makes apparent both the important factors in the sound, and if J. Schmidt, who derides all new-fangled transcriptions, had at least understood this particular one, he would not have made such short work of Bartholomae's argument. The change *s* after *i*, *u*, *ṛ*, *r* to *ś*, which Bartholomae, Brugmann and others place in the Aryan period was a change to a simple *sh*-sound (*ṣ*) and the lingual quality which the sound has in Skt. is a special Skt. development. *S* would not have power to change *n* to *ṇ* until it had itself become *ṣ*, and *in* might have arisen from *inś* before *ś* had become *ṣ*. So I fail to see anything ridiculous in Bartholomae's argument, though I do not myself explain *in* as from *inś*.

directly derived from -ins, or "what is more probable" with š after the analogy of the fem. So he considers the š (ž) in both cases due to the same analogy, but working independently in Skt. and Av. Such a coincidence would be singular, though not absolutely inconceivable, but the forms of the r-stems, which J. Schmidt passes over in silence, add new difficulties to such an hypothesis. Bartholomae has called attention to the identity of Av. *neraš* (monosyllabic, a merely indicating the nasality of the r; cf. his *Handbuch*, §205) and Skt. *nṛ̥n̥r̥ a-* (Rig-Veda, V 54, 15), and to the latter form we may add *nṛ̥n̥s̥ p-* quoted by Whitney (Skt. Gram.² §209 b) from the *Mātrāyaṇī Saṁhita*. How would J. Schmidt account for the presence of the š in Skt., and š in Av.? The Skt. š he might explain as due to the analogy of the fem. forms *matṛ̥s̥*, *svásṛ̥s̥*, in case these forms are not of comparatively late origin, as Bartholomae holds them to be; but for Avestan such an explanation is impossible, for no fem. forms corresponding to Skt. *matṛ̥s̥* exist. We have only *materaš* (Yasna, 38, 5) = Skt. *mātṛ̥n̥* (Rig-Veda, X 35), and *mātarō*, which is nom., not acc., in form.

Or are š and ṣ due to the analogy of the masculines -iṣ, -uṣ and -īṣ, -ūṣ after they themselves had received their š and ṣ from the analogy of the feminines? That such a complicated series of analogies should have worked *independently* in both Skt. and Av. is too much to believe. The only rational theory is that already in the Aryan period masc. forms with final š existed.

Now to the main point for the consideration of which this paper is written. Is it necessary to suppose, with Bartholomae, that the š of Aryan *inš*, etc., is due to analogy? His point is of course that the law by which s after i, u, and ṛ became š had its period of activity in Aryan times, whereas the reduction of the nasal (which would prevent the affection of s by preceding i, etc.) before spirants belongs to the independent development of Skt. and Av., as is shown by the fact that the reduction takes place not merely in words in which the spirant is common to both languages, and therefore Aryan, but also where it is of specific Skt. or Av. origin (cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, §199, note; in *havīṇši*, *āyūṇši* there mentioned the ṣ is due to analogy of other cases, such as *havisām*, where it is regular. But is it so certain that the affection of nasals before spirants in general and that observed in the endings -āns, -īṇš, -ūṇš, are one and the same phenomenon? An argument for their separation in Skt. may be

found in the fact that those Prātiçākhyas which distinguish anusvāra and anunāsika note especially these acc. plur. forms as having nasalized vowel, not anusvāra; cf. Rig-Veda Prātiçākhyā, 795, where is mentioned the *fault* of pronouncing anusvāra instead of anunāsika in certain Sandhi forms, which forms are found by reference to other rules to be exactly our accusatives plural. To be sure certain discrepancies in these authorities, added to the fact that the Atharva-Veda Prātiçākhyā knows only nasalized vowels, has made Whitney skeptical as to any genuine distinction (cf his discussion with Bergaigne in *Mém. de soc. ling.* II, and *Skt. Grammar.*² pgs. 24, 25). But it is hard to believe that such unequivocal statements as the one just referred to are absolutely without foundation, made out of whole cloth. There must have been a real difference in the pronunciation at least in certain dialects and at a certain time,¹ and it is much easier to suppose that this was an original distinction, preserved at the time of the Prātiçākhyas in some dialects, though lost even at this early period in others (as for example that from which the observations in the Atharva Prātiçākhyā were made), than that *vice versa* what was originally the same sound became in certain dialects two different sounds. What hinders us from supposing that in the Aryan period long vowels + nasal + s in final syllables became long nasalized vowels + s, while to the special development of Skt. and Av. belongs the more general reduction of nasals before spirants? The reduction of vowel + nasal to nasalized vowel is, of course, a very gradual one, and it was some intermediate stage in this second and later affection of nasals which was noted and described by the Skt. grammarians under the name of anusvāra. The precise physiological nature of this sound need not concern us here, suffice it to say that it was still sufficiently remote from the objective point of its development (simple nasalized vowel, its present value) to be distinguished from the anunāsika, which, according to my hypothesis, was already a simple nasalized vowel in the Aryan period. The fact that the anusvāra reached its objective point and so became identical with the anunāsika in some districts earlier than in others ought to be sufficient to account for their non-distinction in the Atharva Prātiçākhyas and the discrepancies in the details given by the other authorities.

¹ This view is taken by J. Schmidt in his lectures, who finds further supports for it in the fact that many MSS use different signs for anusvāra (·) and anunāsika (◌̣).

Another proof that the reduction of nasals after long vowels in final syllables should be treated by itself is furnished by the following fact. The contrast of forms like *dann iva* (Rig-Veda, I 149, *dan(n)* from *dans*, gen. of *dam*) and *devān iva* shows that the simplification of two or more final consonants is *older* than the reduction of the nasal in the combination—short vowel + nasal + *s*, but *later* than that in the combination—long vowel + nasal + *s*. So Brugmann says, "Es scheint daraus zu folgen, dass *n* vor nicht satzschliessendem *-s* früher als sonst mit dem vorausgehenden Vocal zu Nasalvocal geworden war" (Grundriss, I, pg. 496; as to the reservation which he adds in reference to the uncertainty of the antiquity of the long vowels in these cases, cf. the excursus).

Now arises the following question. If the Aryan forms of acc. plur. masc. were *-ās*, *-īś*, *-ūś*, whence the full nasal in the common Skt. forms *-ān*, *-īn*, *-ūn*? To think of a restoration of the nasal from the nasalized vowel would be futile. The explanation is that the Vedic doublets *-ān* — *-ān*, *-īnr* — *-īn*, *-ūnr* — *-ūn*, reflect an Aryan, not special Skt., rule of Sandhi; *-āns*, *-īns*, *-ūns* became in the Aryan period *-ān*, *-īn*, *-ūn* as absolute finals, but *-ās*, *-īś*, *-ūś* in Sandhi. In the Indian branch of the family, the forms in *-ān* had even in Vedic times enlarged their sphere, and in classical Skt. they attained the complete supremacy. In Av. the difference is clearly preserved in the *a*-declension, though the representative of *-ās* is found only in the closest combinations, as with a following enclitic particle. So we have in the Gāthas *-ē* (written *-ēng*) almost always with *-ēn* as variant = Aryan *-ān*, but *-ās-ca* = Aryan *-ās*, in the later Av. *-a* (also written *-an*, *-am*), but *-ās-ca*.¹ Bartholomae (cf. Handbuch, §46) considers this *-ēng* of the Gāthas as the representative of Aryan *-ans* (as he would write it now instead of *-ās*) in accordance with his idea of the form of the acc. plur. in Aryan, but he elsewhere (Handbuch, §47) gives examples of *-ēng* = Aryan *-ān*. In the *i*- and *u*-declensions the Sandhi forms *-īś*, *-ūś* won the upper hand and we find *-īś*, *-ūś* in both the Gāthas and later Avesta. It is probable that the entire loss of the nasal is merely orthographical (cf. Bartholomae, K. Z. 29, pg. 455). We might see the representatives of Aryan *-īn*, *-ūn* in a few forms ending in *i* and *u*

¹ For the sake of uniformity we might be tempted to set up *-ēngs* (*-ēs*) as the proper Gātha form before enclitics, on the basis of *yēngs-tu* (Y. 46, 14), but as this form stands alone in the Gāthas against at least half-a-dozen in *-ās-ca*, it is perhaps better, with Bartholomae, to explain *yēngs-tu* as arisen under the influence of *yēng*.

which were formerly taken as acc. plur., but they are altogether uncertain (cf. Bartholomae, *K. Z.* 29, pg. 456).

Excursus.—On the vowel length in the acc. plur. forms.

Both J. Schmidt and Bartholomae write the Aryan forms with short vowel, -ans, etc., and consider the long vowels of Skt. -ān, -īn, -ūn as a specific Skt. development, but neither gives any satisfactory explanation of the lengthening. J. Schmidt (in his lectures) states as a rule, "Auslautendes -ns dehnt vorhergehenden Vocal und dann geht s verloren," and gives forms like ācṡvān as examples. Why then do we not have a dān from dans and āgān from āgans? Bartholomae (*Indogerm. ss.*, pg. 37, foot-note), recognizing the impossibility of bringing the lengthening under any phonetic law, resorts to the principle of analogy. According to him, -ān borrowed its ā from the nom. plur. in -ās, and then after the analogy of devān, etc., the long vowels were introduced into the ī- and ū-declensions. But what compels us to consider the long vowels as special Skt., or in other words what prevents us from considering that the Indo-Eur. forms were -ōns, -īns, -ūns? The fact that the Greek forms can be derived as well from -ōns, -īns, -ūns as from -ons, etc., is acknowledged (cf. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*², pg. 125), and it remains to run through the other branches of the Indo-Eur. family and discover if any one of them possesses forms which necessarily presuppose the existence of Indo-Eur. -ons, etc., with short vowel.¹ First to finish with the Aryan branch. From the Av. forms no conclusion as to the original length of the vowels can be drawn. For the ēng of the Gāthas can represent an original long vowel as well as a short, and the sign which is transcribed a (Justi ā) is used for both long and short vowels (cf. Bartholomae, *Handbuch*, §§14, 32). In the ī- and ū-declensions the best MSS usually read -īš, -ūš, but there are nearly always variants in -iš, -uš, so that I will not claim anything more than that they *can* be derived from forms with long vowels. But the Old Persian acc. plur. forms in ā (martiyā, 'men,' hamaranā, 'battles,' etc.) not only *can*, but apparently *must* be derived from Aryan -ān(s). True, an Aryan final a is represented in the Old Persian inscriptions by ā (whether or not

¹ Hannsen, *K. Z.* 27, p. 615, note, has already expressed himself in favor of Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc. So too Bremer, *Berlin. Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1887, p. 502, note, implies the same opinion, inasmuch as he mentions τῶνς = Skt. tān in the same category with ἰπποῖς = Skt. ācṡvāiṣ.)

the lengthening is merely orthographical does not concern us here), but an Aryan final *a* + cons. is not written long; cf. *udapatatā*, 3d sing. imperf. mid. = Skt. *udápatata*, but *abara* = Skt. *ábharat* or *ábharan*, *atarsa* = Skt. *átrasat*, etc. (cf. Bartholomae, *Handbuch*, §35; Spiegel, *Die altpersische Keilinschriften*, pg. 188). So an Aryan *an(s)* would give *a*, not *ā*, and *martiyā*, etc., can be derived only from forms with long vowel.¹

In Armenian, *mards* 'men' (o-stem), *sirts* 'hearts' (i-stem), *zards* 'adornments' (u-stem), *s* is the representative of -ns, the vowels having dropped out. But long as well as short vowels in final syllables are regularly dropped in Armenian (cf. Hübschmann, *Armenische Studien*, I, pg. 57), so that nothing speaks against the supposition of Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc.

Returning to Europe, let us consider the forms offered by Latin and the other dialects of Italy. The long vowels of Lat. *equōs*, *trīs*, and *fructūs* are explained as the result of compensative lengthening after the loss of the nasal in -ons, etc., but -ons, etc., may stand for Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc., for in Lat. we have the same law as in Greek; long vowels are shortened before *i*, *u*, liquids and *nasals* + mute or spirant (cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, §612). From Umbrian *poplof*, *popluf*, in which *f* is for *ns*, as regularly in Umbrian, the length of the vowel cannot be determined. In the nom. plur. *poplos*, *poplur* the *o* and *u* denote long vowels, and so they may in *poplof*, *popluf*. The same is true of the forms of the *j*- and *u*-declension, *trif* 'tres,' *kastruvuf* 'fundos.' So also in Oscan *feihoss* 'fines,' *leḡgoss* 'milites delectos,' *teremniſs* 'terminos' (if acc., not, as Bücheler thinks, abl. = *terminibus*), the quantity of the vowel is uncertain.

Old Irish *firu* 'men,' *fáthi* 'poets,' *gnīmu* 'actions,' are to be immediately derived from forms in -ōs, -is, -ūs, since a short vowel would have disappeared completely, and that the long vowels are the result of compensative lengthening is merely possible, not necessary; -ōns could have resulted in nothing but -ōs.

The Gothic forms like *dagans* 'days,' *gastins* 'guests,' *sununs* 'sons' show short vowels and, as is shown by the *a* of *dagans*, these must have been short even in prehistoric Teutonic, but we have to reckon with the possibility that in the earliest period of separate Teutonic development a law was active similar to that which worked in Greek and Latin, namely, 'long vowels are shortened

¹ Of course we have to reckon with the possibility that these are nominative forms used accusatively, but if they are genuine accusatives, which we have no reason to doubt, they prove an Aryan -ān(s).

before *i*, *u*, liquids and nasals + mute or spirant.' At least before *n* + mute or spirant, the only case which concerns our theory, such a shortening is made probable by Gothic *vinds*, Anglo-Saxon *wind*, as related to Skt. *vānt-*, pres. ppl. of *√vā* 'to blow' (cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, §614).

The acc. plur. forms in the Baltic and Slavic families have always been derived from *-ons*, etc., but if, as Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I, §615) holds, original long vowels were shortened before *i* or nasal + mute or spirant, *-ons* might very well stand for Indo-Eur. *-ōns*. There seem, however, to be some elements of uncertainty in this law, though a few forms, especially the acc. plur. of the *ā* stems in Lithuanian and Old Bulgarian, have as yet found no other explanation. It may therefore be worth the while to show that the Baltic and Slavic forms in question may be derived *directly* from Indo-Eur. *-ōns*, *-ins*, *-ūns*. The stages in the development of the Old Bulgarian forms as given by Leskien in his lectures (cf. also his *Handbuch d. altbulg. Sprache*, pg. 19, slightly different in the treatment of the *o*-stems) are as follows:

¹ ons ...	² ōns ...	ōn ...	ūn ...	y	e. g.	toky 'streams.'
uns ...	ūns ...	ūn ...	y	e. g.	syny 'sons.'	
ins ...	īns ...	īn ...	i	e. g.	nošti 'nights.'	

From this see that with the supposition of Indo-Eur. *-ōns*, etc., we are one step nearer the actual Old Bulgarian forms. For the *-ę* of the *jo*-stems, as in *konje* 'horses,' he gives the following development: *-jons*, *-jēns*, *-jēns*, *-jēn*, *-jē*. An Indo-Eur. *-ōns* would save one stage, for we should have *jōns*, *jēns*, *jēn*, *jē*.

We turn now to the Baltic family where matters are more complicated. In the Old Prussian forms in *-ans* and *-ins* the vowels may be long, since long and short vowels are not usually distinguished, and then they would be the regular representatives of Indo-Eur. *-ōns*, *-ins*, Prussian *ā* being = Indo-Eur. *ō*. In Lithuanian the forms of the *i* and *u* declensions, like *akis* 'eyes,' *dangūs* 'heavens,' may be from Indo-Eur. *-īns*, *-ūns*, since long vowels are shortened in final syllables with "gestossenen" accent (cf. Leskien, *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, V 188). The acc. plur. of the *o*-stems ends in *-ūs* (*-ūs-jos* in definite adjective), and it is usual to derive this from an older *-ans* = Indo-Eur. *-ons*. But such a change of *an* to *u*, common enough in Lettic, would be isolated in Lithuanian, and, moreover, the acc. plur. fem. forms of adjectives, such as *pirmàs*, 'first,' definite adjective *pirmàs-es*, compared with *pirmans-es*, which is found frequently in Old

Lithuanian texts (sixteenth century) actually show that -ans does not give -us, -ūs-, but -as, -ās-. Now wherever else in Lithuanian we find an u in final syllable with "gestossenen" accent beside an ū in non-final syllable, it is always derived from Indo-Eur. ō. So, for example, in nom. acc. dual of o-stems we have dēvū 'two gods,' but in the definite adjective, in which the second element was added so long ago that the last syllable of the adjective proper is not to be considered a final, jaunū-ju, and here, of course, ū, ū- are from Indo-Eur. ō; cf. Gr. ἰππῶ. In the same way may our acc. plur. forms, as dēvūs, in def. adj. jaunūs-jus, be derived from Indo-Eur. -ōns. So in Lettic grékus 'sins' the u is from ū by the law, "In every final syllable a long vowel becomes short, a diphthong a monophthong," and Lett. ū = Lith. ū = Indo-Eur. ō. The ū is preserved in monosyllabic words, which are exempt from the working of the above rule. So tōs, jōs etc., o after Bielenstein to represent the ū with "gedehnten" accent. In náktis 'nights,' etc., of the i-declension, the i is shortened from ī by the law of final syllables quoted above. There are no plur. forms of u-stems in Lettic.

We have now completed our survey of the various branches of the Indo-Eur. family (Albanian has no forms which have any bearing on the question in hand) and have found no forms which cannot, without the violation of any known phonetic law, be derived from -ōns, -īns, -ūns, whereas in Sanskrit, Old Persian, and Lithuanian exist forms which cannot be "laut-gesetzlich" derived from -ons, -ins, -uns. There ought to be no objection to admitting -ōns, etc., as Indo-Eur. on the ground that the origin of such forms is more difficult to explain. Our knowledge of the original formation of cases is too small for us to allow it to have any influence on our determination of the forms which actually existed at the period just preceding the breaking up into the various families.

BERLIN, June 18, 1890.

Since the above was written the new volume of Brugmann's Grundriss, which treats of declension, has appeared, and in this I see that some of my results have been anticipated. Brugmann also has concluded that the š of Aryan -īnš, etc., is not due to analogy, but arose phonetically owing to an earlier reduction of nasals after long vowels. The fact that he has reached this result without the aid of what was to me the chief argument, namely, the distinction between anunāsika and anusvāra, may in itself help to prove that this argument is correct. Perhaps the chief reason of

Whitney's scepticism as to any real distinction (aside from his well-founded distrust of the Hindu grammarians on general principles) lay in the fact that there was apparently no *raison d'être* for any such distinction. In *Mém. de la soc. ling.* II, pg. 197, he says in regard to our attitude toward the statements of the *Rig-Veda Prātiçākhyā*, "Un pas important serait de déterminer s'il est dans la nature de la chose une raison quelconque pour que le peu de cas dans lesquelles la voyelle nasale est admise produisent une altération différente du reste. Je n'aborde point cette discussion, me bornant à observer que je ne puis voir aucun motif de faire une telle distinction."

But now we have a reason. Those few cases in which the nasalized vowel is admitted are exactly the ones in which the nasal suffered an earlier reduction than elsewhere. To illustrate my idea of the process I take the acc. plur. form of *aṁsa*, "shoulder," using *ṁ* to denote the nasalized vowel, and *aⁿ* for an intermediate stage between *an* and *ṁ*, a stage in which the nasal still preserved something of its quality as an independent element.

- | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| I. | <i>ansā</i> 's in Sandhi, | <i>ansān</i> as absolute final. | | |
| II. | <i>aⁿsās</i> | " | <i>aⁿsān</i> | " " |
| III. | <i>asās</i> | " | <i>asān</i> | " " |

The statements of the *Rig-Veda Prātiçākhyā* are in agreement with II, those of the *Atharva-Veda Prātiçākhyā* with III, in which the nasal had become as thoroughly merged with the vowel in the first syllable as in the second and, there no longer existed any genuine distinction between *anunāsika* and *anusvāra*.

In regard to the vowel length, Brugmann leaves it an open question whether the endings were -ons, etc., or -ōns, etc., but gives the forms with short vowels the preference. He has anticipated me in rejecting the usual derivation of Lithuanian -ūs-, ūs- from -āns = Indo-Eur. -ons, but says it is equally impossible to derive it from -ōns since this would also have become -āns. He therefore explains the ū as a transfer from the loc. plur. in -ūsū, -ūse, but even here the ū is not original, but, according to Brugmann, due to proportional analogy with ā-stems. Further, this newly created -ūns reacted on the locative and gave rise to the nasal in the dialectic *vilkunse*. This explanation has nothing improbable in it and, though complicated, seems the only possible one, if -ōns would, as Brugmann holds, have resulted in -āns. But this point does not seem to me to be definitely settled. That long vowels were shortened in Baltic before *j* + cons. can scarcely be

denied in face of *vilkāis* = Skt. *vrkāis*, Indo-Eur. *-ōis*, but that this shortening also took place before nasal + cons. is, I think, not strictly proved. Osthoff (M. V. II, pg. 129) set up the law, "ā wird in der stellung vor sonorlaut in derselben Silbe verkürzt," but some of the forms which are used to prove this are sufficiently explained by Leskien's law, which had not been discovered at that time. In *Geschichte d. Perfect*, pg. 85, he thinks the law is possibly to be amended to "langer vocal vor einem sonorlaut und hinterher folgenden geräuschlaute ging in die entsprechende kürze über," and this is essentially the form in which it appears in Brugmann's *Grundriss* (I §615). The forms which are there given as coming under this law are (as far as nasal + cons. is concerned): (1) gerunds of denominative verbs as *jéskant* from *-ōnt*; (2) acc. plur. of *ā*-stems. As for the acc. plur. forms Prof. Brugmann, who has had the kindness to look through the proofs of the above article, informs me that he now no longer considers these as examples of this law. The nouns never had a nasal, as is shown by the fact that the dialects which preserve a nasal show no trace of one in this case (cf. *Grundriss* II, §327), and the case of *pirmans-es* is involved in so many uncertainties that it can hardly be used for or against the law. So the case rests simply on gerunds of the type of *jéskant*, and these at least *admit* of another explanation, namely, that they are formed after the analogy of simple thematic verbs. Osthoff (M. V. II, pg. 130), to be sure, thinks this improbable, inasmuch as the *i*-verbs show no such influence; cf. *mýlint*, but the *possibility* of such an explanation can scarcely be denied. A phonetic law which is not strictly proved may be judged by its fruits, that is, we should weigh that which it explains against that the explanation of which it makes more difficult. The law in point explains *jeszkant*, but makes the explanation of Lith. *-ūs* less simple, and forces us to separate Lith. *-us* from Old Prussian *-ans* in one or two other cases. If we deny the law we make *jéskant* difficult, but explain *-ūs*-, *-ūs* as regular forms. In this case we should consider these the source of the *-ū* in the locative ending, instead of vice versa, as Brugmann, who is obliged to suppose two processes of analogy as explained above. Moreover, if we deny the law we are not forced to separate the Lith. dat. plur. ending *-mus* from the Old Prussian *-mans*. I would not, however, lay much stress on this point, for the forms of this ending in Balto-Slavic are in such a tangle that it is only a small gain to bring any two of them under one head.

CARL D. BUCK.

III.—THE VALUE OF THE MEDIAE (*b, d, g*) IN OLD LATIN AND ITALIC.

Every one knows that the symbol C represents a *g* in the regular Latin abbreviations for the proper names *Gaius* and *Gnaeus*, and the fact that the Greek sign for the guttural media was used in the Latin alphabet to represent originally both the media and the tenuis, and finally only the tenuis, is one of the paradoxes that have ceased to be surprising to us through long familiarity. Yet it certainly needs explanation, and those that have hitherto been offered hardly do more than recognize the difficulty.¹ The reason seems to be that if we confine our attention to Latin alone there is no explanation to be had, but if the fact be put into connexion with similar but still more striking phenomena in the allied dialects, we are led to a general conclusion which is of some importance. I believe it can be demonstrated from the evidence, which is of many different kinds and comes from very various sources, that the Mediae (*b, d, g*) were originally voiceless in Italic and retained their voiceless character in the separate dialects (Latin and Umbro-Samnite) for a considerable time after their separation, and longer in Oscan and Umbrian than in Latin, where in the historical period they became voiced.

If it be necessary to explain what is meant by a voiceless media, a few words may be quoted from the *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft*, Vol. I, §§16 and 322 (pp. 20 and 260 in the English translation): 'When the breath is checked in the larynx in such a manner that the vocal chords, which in a state of

¹ Corssen (*Aussprache*, I 10) regarded the confusion as simply an archaic inaccuracy which was discarded when the Latins began to be familiar with Greek. But 312 B. C., which is probably the date when the new sign G was introduced (v. infra), is surely a little too early for such an assumption. And why did not the inaccuracy extend also to *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*? Corssen is followed by Jordan and Seelmann, but the latter adds: 'Wahrscheinlich standen sich einst der harte und der weiche Gaumenlaut überhaupt näher, und kam erst später, als die sprachliche Entwicklung die Kluft vergrösserte, auch dem gewöhnlichen Beobachter der Unterschied beider Laute grell genug zum Bewusstsein, um auf einen entsprechenden orthographischen Unterschied zu dringen' (*Aussprache*, p. 343 ff.)

rest are apart, are brought so far together as to come into rhythmical vibration, a musical sound arises which is called Voice.' 'The characteristic feature [of the distinction between *Tenuis* and *Mediae*] is the greater or less tension to which the parts of the mouth are put in forming the explosive, e. g. a more energetic closing and opening of the lips takes place with *p* than with *b* . . . The mediae may be produced with or without voice.' The point is a little difficult for English-speaking students to grasp, as we grow up in the assumption that all mediae are voiced as they are in our own language. All voiced sounds must be mediae, that is, they must be pronounced with relatively less force than they would be if they were voiceless, since the current of breath loses part of its strength in setting the vocal chords in vibration: but the converse of course does not hold good; all mediae are not necessarily voiced; the greater gentleness or 'softness' of the stream of breath may be due to other causes than the interference of the vocal chords, for instance, simply to a less energetic expiration.

To begin then with the evidence in Latin. The third sign of the Greek alphabet was used by the Romans till the end of the fourth century B. C. to denote indifferently the guttural media and tenuis. This is expressly recorded by several ancient grammarians (cited by Seelmann, p. 342 f.) and illustrated by a large number of examples of *C = g* on inscriptions; see the Index of the Corp. Inscr. Lat. I, p. 601. Now if at the time that the Greek alphabet came into use the Latins possessed two sounds as clearly distinguished as, say, *c* in Eng. *call* and *g* in *gall*, and found this distinction regularly represented by *K* and *C* in the alphabet they were adopting, is it conceivable that they should have arbitrarily taken only the second symbol to denote them both? On the other hand, if the difference between the Latin *c* and *g* was, so to speak, only one of degree, not of kind, if they were both voiceless and only distinguished by the strength of their articulation, it is natural enough that two signs should seem superfluous. The variation is not greater than that of quantity whether in consonants or vowels, which as a rule we find unexpressed in writing, at least in primitive alphabets; in Latin we know that long or doubled consonants did not come into use until towards the end of the second century B. C., and the short-lived attempts at a similar notation for vowels date from about the same period.

It must be observed, however, that the signs for *d* and *t*, *b* and

p were not confused,¹ as we should expect them to have been if all the mediae were voiceless. To this I should reply that the change from the voiceless to the voiced sound need not necessarily have taken place at exactly the same time in all the three classes of explosives. There are very similar variations in the history of the Lautverschiebung in the Germanic dialects (see the *Grundriss*, §§530, 537). For example, the spirants *þ* and *ð* became *b* and *d* initially in the prehistoric period of West-Germanic (A. S. *bitan* 'to bite,' root *bhejd-*, *dæz* 'day,' root *dhegh-*), whereas *ȝ* in the same position was still preserved in Anglo-Saxon though later it became *g* (A. S. *ȝōs* 'goose,' *ȝiest* 'guest'). Here the phonetic conditions are precisely the same except for the difference in the class of sound affected. In Latin I suppose that *d* and *b* had become voiced rather earlier than *g*, and that the Greek alphabet had begun to be used in the interval. This agrees fairly well with such evidence as we have for the early history of the Latin characters. The invention of G to denote the voiced media as distinguished from C is ascribed by Jordan (*Krit. Beiträge*, p. 157) to Appius Claudius Censor 312 B. C. (it first appears in the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus Censor 290 B. C.), and we must allow some time for the inconsistency in writing to make itself felt

¹ The traces of any such confusion are far too scanty and uncertain to be trusted. In the Song of the Arval Brethren (C. I. L. I 28) *advocapit* may stand for *advocabit* (?), but we cannot tell how ancient the form may be. *poplicos* is, of course, the original form of the later *publicus*, which must owe its *b* as well as its *u* to the influence of some analogy. *propom* 'probum' (C. I. L. I 19) is practically Oscan, v. infra. Festus gives a form *sibus persibus* 'sapiens' which may possibly be the same word as Osc. *sipus* 'sciens,' where the *p* is certain y original, as it is an old perf. partic. act. of *sapio*. The *t* in *Alixentrom*, C. I. L. I 59, if it is not a mere mistake, is possibly an attempt to Latinize the unfamiliar ending *-dro-*. The only examples free from doubt are one or two of *d* for *t* finally. *fecid*, in an early inscription, C. I. L. I 59, no doubt shows the original ending of the 3d person of secondary tenses, which is found in the Duenos and Numasioi inscriptions, and regularly in Oscan. The difference between *fecid* and *dedit* on the well-known Praenestine cista (ib. 55) is explained by the relative position of the two lines, which seems to show that they were written at different times and by different persons. In the artist's signature we may suspect a little archaism. Two more examples, *quod* for *quot*, at for *ad* (C. I. L. I 1016, 1252) date from the end of the Republic, when it is well known that final *-d* was often confused with *-t* as in *haud*, *haut* (Seelmann, 358 f.). I know of no other examples. Hence it seems to me far more probable that *d* and *b* became voiced sooner than *g*, than that all three remained voiceless till the same date, and that the symbols B and P, D and T were kept distinct by a mere accident.

after the new sound had become established. That brings us within reasonable distance of the date which we may assume for the introduction of the Greek alphabet. In the *Numasioi* inscription, which is referred by archaeologists to the end of the sixth century B. C., we have still a Greek, not a Roman character, as appears from the use of *Fh*, not *F*, to denote *f* (Darbishire, *Journal of Philology*, XVI, p. 196). It is worth noting, however, that *d* is represented twice by *δ* as we should expect; *g* does not occur, but *shēfhaked* 'fecit' gives us *κ* for *c*. In the *Duenos* inscription, which probably belongs to the first half of the fourth century, *t* and *d* are regularly distinguished,¹ > appears for *g* and for *c*, but in the latter use it is twice a correction of a *κ* which was written first and is only half erased. This seems to show that the sound of *g* had already become clearly separated from that of *k*.

In the Faliscan alphabet again, which is closely akin to the Latin, we have no signs for either *b* or *g* (*cupat* 'cubat,' *Ca*. 'Gaius'), though *d* occurs. In a Latin inscription, written by Faliscans (Zvétaieff, *Inscr. Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae*, 72a), a votive offering made by a college of cooks, which can hardly be earlier (*pace* Seelmann, p. 344) than 200-150 B. C., *g* is twice written for *c* (*gondecorant, Volgani*). This possibly indicates that even at that date the *tenuis* and *mediae* were not sharply distinguished in Faliscan itself, but since the letters are used regularly in the rest of the inscription, no great stress can be laid on these two examples, which may be merely slips of the engraver. See Seelmann, loc. cit.

In Umbrian the facts are striking. There are no signs in the native alphabet for either *d* or *g* which appear simply as *t* and *k*, and the sign for *b* is rarely used and alternates with *p* (*habinaf* Ia 27, *hapinaf* Ia 24).² But when the later stage of Umbrian is written in Latin characters (Tab. V iii, VI and VII) we have the two classes of sound distinguished with general though not absolute regularity: *apru f* 'apros' I b 24 = *abrof*³ VII a 3, *titu* 'dato' Ia 33 = *ditu* VI b 10, *kumia f* 'gravidas' I a 7 = *gomia* VI a 58, etc.

¹ Assuming that the explanation of *mitat* as 3d pl. (A. J. P. X, p. 452) is correct. *d* is regularly represented by Δ twelve times in other words in the inscription.

² It is, however, always written *b* when it represents an original *g* (*bum* 'bovem,' *benus* 'veneris'). It seems to me possible that here it represents a different sound, the labial spirant *β* (Engl. *v*).

³ The *tenuis* is of course original in this word, but all *tenuis* became *mediae* in Umbrian after *n* and before *r* (Brugmann, *Grundriss* I, §499).

This of course shows that the two were not absolutely identical even in the period when they were represented by the same symbols. The few exceptions there are (*totcor* VI a 12 beside *totceir* VI a 10 al., *entelust* VI b 50 beside *endendu* VI b 40 al., *Iapusco* VII a 47 beside *Iabuscer* VII a 12, etc.) may be merely accidental lapses into the spelling of the archaic version of the ritual of which tables VI and VII were a reconstruction. On the other hand they may indicate that even in later Umbrian the sound of the mediae was not quite the same as it was in Latin. In any case the evidence of the Umbrian alphabet is surely enough to show that originally the sound of the mediae was not very widely removed from that of the tenues. The Greek-Etruscan alphabet, from which the Umbrian was derived, possessed signs for the mediae at the time of the transference (see Mommsen, *Unterital. Dialekte*, p. 21, and Kirchhoff, *Stud. z. Geschichte d. Gr. Alphabets*, ed. 4, p. 127 ff.); and even if it had not, the Umbrians would surely have invented new symbols for *g* and *d* if they were separated from *k* and *t* by as definite a line as that between breathed and voiced sounds, just as they did for *ç* (d) and *f* (8).

It should be noticed further that this confusion in writing between tenuis and media occurs between the spirants derived from them. *ç* (d) is properly the spirant derived from *k* before palatal vowels (*çersna* = Lat. *cena*-), while *i* is used to denote the parallel modification of *g* (*muietu* partic. beside *mugatu* imperat.). But we find them used interchangeably: *i* for *ç*, e. g. in *usaie* (I b 45) = *usaçe* II a 44 'yearly,' which is formed with the ordinary adjectival suffix *-ko-*, and also, I believe, in *purtius* I a 27 al. = *purtingus* I b 33 al., a second future derived from the *-nk-* perfect (cf. Osc. *λιοκ-ακ-ειτ*), from a present **purtueo*;¹ in the first form the nasal is omitted, as it frequently is before consonants. Conversely we have *ç* for *i* in *açetus* (II a 14) 'agentibus' beside the imperative *aitu* (I b 49 al.), which

¹ Imperat. *purtu vetu*, partic. *purditom*. The long *-i-* appears to be the regular Umbrian representative of *ū* in unaccented syllables (i. e. in all but the first) as well as in monosyllabic words (*pir* 'πῆρ,' etc.); cf. *statita* = Lat. *statula*, and the oblique cases of *u*-nouns which have regularly *-i-*, *mani* 'manu,' *treſi* 'tribu,' *açputrati* 'arbitratu,' *ahtim* 'actum' beside the dative *ahtu* (I a 10) where the *-u* perhaps represents a diphthong. *ceheſi* = **censu* 'accendendo,' *trahvorſi* = **transversu*. From *purtu-* we have also *purti fe le* 'porricibilem.' In the compound *purtupite*, as in the impv. *purtu vetu*, the *u* is no doubt short. The change should probably be assumed for Oscan as well; *castrid* abl. beside *castrous* genitive.

is a contraction for **aj-itu* from **agetōd*. *deitu* 'dicito' may be most simply explained, I think, in the same way, as standing for **dēctu* from **deicetod*.¹

The Oscan system of orthography is exceedingly precise (for example, the glide *u* is regularly written between the vowel *u* and a following vowel, *eitiuvam*), and we should expect to find that the distinction between tenuis and media was regularly maintained in writing, even though it were only one of degree. This is so to a remarkable extent; but the fact that when Oscan is written in Greek or Latin characters the two classes of sound are at once confused, is in itself an important piece of evidence in favor of the theory we are considering. The details of this confusion we must examine shortly, but we may notice first what evidence may be found in Oscan itself. To begin with, there are one or two doubtful forms in which the two classes of sound appear to be confused even in the local alphabet. The least uncertain is [*l*] *ūfrīkūnūss* (Zv. It. Inf. 95, the well-known fragment from Pietrabbondante), which is generally taken as equivalent to *liberigenos*. The other two are *akenei* on the Tabula Agnone (Zv. It. Inf. 87), which Bücheler renders 'agine,' i. e. 'in agonio,' 'in sacrificio,' and *deketasiūt* (Cipp. Abell. 5), generally rendered 'digitario' 'τῷ πεμπάσῳτι,' 'the financial officer,' an epithet of *medix*. Both of these are uncertain. It must be noticed, however, that in all three the sign of the tenuis is substituted for that of the media, and not vice versa.

Another point which seems to me of considerable importance is the frequency of words in the few Oscan inscriptions that there are, in which a tenuis immediately follows a media, or vice versa. If the two sounds were of really different character we should certainly expect an assimilation, such as we find in Latin. It will be seen from the nature of the words that they cannot be explained in the same way as such spellings as *scribsi* in Latin, i. e. as being merely attempts at etymological correctness, since the syllable in which the combination occurs does not vary in inflexion. The examples are: *metd*. (an abbreviation for *meddix* Zv. Inscr. It. Inf. 94; ² the first half of a doubled consonant would naturally seem to be pronounced more emphatically than the second); *aikdāfed* (Zv. It. Inf. 93), *liganakdiket* (Tab. Agn., Zv. It. Inf. 87),

¹ *Feitu fetu* are puzzling. Is *fetu* formed directly from the root *dhē-*, and *feitu* a re-formation, on its analogy, of an older **faitu* **factu* = Lat. *facito*?

² Cp. Brugm. Grundriss II, §163 ad fin. p. 493 in the English edition.

Anagtiai (Zvét. It. Inf. 107), *Pupdiis* (ib. 226), *Maakdiis* (ib. 266), *sebsik* (ib. 154), *igipaarigtis* (ib. 175), and *Albsi patre* in Aequian (ib. 46). Compare also the Umbr. *todceir*.

There are one or two examples of an *h* added to the tenuis, which may, I think, be naturally regarded as due to the desire to express its emphatic pronunciation as contrasted with the media: two are in one inscr., *Perkhen.* and *Aphinis* (Zvét. It. Inf. 166). The third is on the Tabula Bantina, in Latin alphabet, where *phim* 'quem' stands simply for *pim*. A curious spelling in Greek characters *Αππελλουνη* (ib. 232) seems to be another method of expressing the distinctive character of the Oscan tenuis, by doubling the letter. We have the same spelling once in the Oscan alphabet (*Appelluneis*, ib. 156 a) in an inscription from Pompeii. This, it must be admitted, may be merely a trace of the old Italic first syllable accent.

Not the least important part of the evidence for the theory in Oscan is the representation of the Oscan mediae by tenues in foreign alphabets. The converse, i. e. a tenuis represented by a media, nowhere occurs. The coins of 'Atella,' as the Latins called it, show the legend *Aderl.* (Zvét. It. Inf. 271).¹ In the Tabula Bantina, beside words in which the Oscan mediae are represented by the Lat. *b, d, g* (*Bansae, angetuzet*, etc.), we have *acum* for the regular infinitive = 'agere,' *licud* (as well as *ligud*) = 'lege,' *cebnust*,² i. e. **gebnust* = 'venerit,' and the difficult *hipid* = 'habuerit.' This is the regular subjunctive form from a perfect stem *hīp-* = **hēp-*, like *ēgi, cēpi*, etc. But whence comes the *p*? Goth. *haban* shows that the Lat. *b* in *habeo* must represent I.-Eu.

¹ *Combulleria* (Liv. 23, 39), *Cubullerinus* (Pliny) are the later Latin forms of *Compulleria* (Liv. 24, 20). The Oscan coin-legend *Kupelternum* (Zv. It. Inf. 268) of course corresponds to the older form. The change of tenuis to media in Latin is regular between a nasal and a liquid; cf. *singuli* for **sem-cloi*.

² This difficult form I believe may be safely explained by supposing that when two consecutive syllables began with a velar in early Oscan the first lost its velar character and became an ordinary guttural; *cebn-* = **gegn-*. This is supported by the form *po-capit* 'quom-cunque,' where *-capit* = **quam-quid*. There are no forms in Oscan which would contradict such a rule. Oscan *b*, of course, regularly represents an original velar *g*. Indeed it seems to do so not only where it became *v* in Latin (*venio* : *venust*) but also where it became *g*. The word *brateis* of the Tab. Bant. (*brateis auti cadeis amnud* 'amicitiae aut inimicitiae causa') may be simply explained as = Lat. *grati* (neut.) (: Skr. *gṛāts*, I.-Eu. **gṛāts*) or **gratis* (sing. fem.) which would give us exactly the sense that is wanted.

bh. I believe both the Oscan and the Umbrian word (*habetu*, *habust*, etc.)¹ were borrowed from Latin and pronounced in provincial fashion, that is, with as near an imitation of a voiced media as Oscan and Umbrian throats could attain to. There is an exact parallel to this in the coin-legend *Benventod: propom* (C. I. L. 1, 19), i. e. 'a Benevento: probum,' where the Latin word is pronounced in Oscan fashion and spelled accordingly. The use of the ablative on a coin proves the Oscan influence. *hipid*, etc., have an official meaning (*comono hipust* 'comitia habuerit'), and so belong to the class of words that are most frequently borrowed; cf. *kvaistur*, *aidil*, neither of which can be genuine Oscan. The difficulty of explaining these perfect forms has been increased by the future form '*hafiēst*' or '*hafiert*' (sic), where the *f* has been regarded as the original Oscan sound. I believe it is as much a blunder of the engraver as the *i* or *r* (whichever it is) of the last syllable, as the *p* instead of *f* in '*sefacust*' a few lines later on, which, happily, no one has attempted to treat seriously. The Umbrian *habiest* shows us the true form which in the Osco-Latin character of the Tabula Bantina would have been written *hapiest*. A glance at the text of this inscription will convince the most confiding student that its engraver has very little character to lose. In this case, however, the mistake may have been simply a confusion between the Oscan 8 (*f*) and P in reading the original copy of the Oscan version, which in the first instance would naturally be written in Oscan characters. The same sign in Umbrian is confused with Ө (*h*) in the form '*erafont*' (Tab. Ig. VI b 65) for the usual *erahunt* *erahont*.

Finally, we have a set of examples which are especially interesting as they form the only exceptions to a rule of Italic accordance which itself is of considerable importance, generally known as Bugge's canon (K. Z. XXII 385). He first pointed out that the secondary tenses and the subjunctive were distinguished in Oscan and the other dialects by special endings in the 3d person sing. and pl.; the primary tenses have *-t* in the singular and *-nt* in the plural, the secondary (and the subjunctive) *-d* and *-ns* respectively. This rule is without exception in the inscriptions in

¹ The difference between Osc. *hipust* and Umbr. *habust* may be compared with that between Osc. *sefacust* and Umbr. *fakust*. The Umbr. impv. *hahnu* 'capito' seems to show the original Umbr. word in a non-thematic conjugation.

Oscan character;¹ there are 22 examples of *-d* in secondary tenses and the subjunctive. Primary tenses do not occur so often; if we do not count the future and future perfect, which always end in *-st*, there are only three examples² in Oscan (*stait, sakruvit, faamat*), but the last word occurs several times. In Umbrian, where final *-t* has a weak sound, there are two presents in which it is written (*tiçit, trebeit*); but final *-d* was completely lost, and hence we should expect the third person of the secondary tenses always to end in a vowel, as it does without exception. There is a present in *-t* in Marrucinian (*feret*) and in Vestinian (*didet*). The rule for the plural is absolute in all the Umbro-Samnite dialects. Hence when we find *-r* in Greek character (3 times, *λιοκακειτ, λεικειτ, δεδετ*) and *-t* once in Latin (*tadait* 'aestimaverit') beside *-d* (*deivaid fuid*, etc.) with other examples of final *-r* and *-t* for Osc. *-d* (*πωτ = pūd* 'quod,' *εσοτ* 'illud,' *pocapit* (Tab. Bant.) = *pū k kapt d* on the Terminus Abellanus), we have a right to conclude that the variation is due to the difficulty of representing the Oscan sound in the foreign alphabets. This was Bugge's view long ago, even though he had no explanation of the difference.

It is possible that in the originally voiceless character of the Oscan mediae we have the explanation of the change of tenuis to media in a few proper names and other words in passing from Greek into Latin, *Burrus* = *Πύρρος*, *Bruges* = *Φρύγες*, *gubernare* = *κυβερνάν*. The names were probably first used in Southern Italy, and the Greek tenuis may have sounded to Oscan ears more like a media than a tenuis in their own language. They reached Latin through oral intercourse, probably before the date at which the Latin mediae became voiced; even if it was later, it is quite conceivable that in popular Latin the Oscan mediae should be regarded as voiced sounds, while the official interpreters were in doubt whether to represent them as breathed or voiced.

It must be admitted, I think, that taken altogether the evidence is very strongly in favour of the theory that the Italic mediae were originally far nearer to the tenues in character than they appear in classical Latin. Exactly how much nearer it is not quite easy to define. For simplicity's sake I have spoken only of 'voiced'

¹ Unless we are to count as such *kahad* and *dadid* (*pon kahad, svai neip dadid*) in the Curse of Vibia, which, however, I regard as subjunctives. *pon* regularly takes the subjunctive in Oscan.

² Not counting the doubtful *aket* or *saket* 'agit'? (Zv. It. Inf. 247).

and 'voiceless' sounds, but I should be content to regard those we have been discussing as 'whispered'¹ rather than absolutely voiceless. Indeed, the former alternative is perhaps more probable, considering the regularity with which they subsequently developed into voiced sounds.

May we venture to draw any conclusions from the Italic phenomena as to the nature of the mediae in proethnic Indo-European? I cannot help thinking it would be a very pardonable heresy to believe that there also the mediae were voiceless or whispered. Would not this make it easier to understand how they became voiceless in Armenian (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I §484) and Germanic? And why the original *tenuēs*, strongly pronounced as compared with the mediae, became *affricatae* (κχ, ts, etc.) and then *fricatives* in the same branch of language? There are still voiceless mediae in High German dialects (in the Harz and in Bad Ems; see Vietor, *Phonetische Studien*, I, p. 216 ff., and III, p. 128). Again, on this supposition Verner's Law would be simply the change of a strongly articulated to a less strongly articulated fricative, due to its position in an unaccented syllable. Finally, would it not be easier to conceive how the aspirated mediae were actually pronounced, and why they all became voiceless in Greek, and, originally, in Italic? These points I must be content to leave as suggestions; but I cannot think we shall be wrong in starting from the assumption that the mediae were either voiceless or whispered in proethnic Italic.

R. SEYMOUR CONWAY.

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
August 29, 1890.

¹ A 'whispered' sound is produced when the vocal chords are approximated but not stretched. The result is a kind of rustle, intermediate between breath and voice.

IV.—THE CODEX MATRITENSIS OF PLUTARCH AND PLUT. CIC. 29.

After relating the well known adventure of P. Clodius Pulcher at the festival of the Bona Dea and his subsequent failure to prove an alibi because Cicero expressly testified to his presence in Rome on the day in question, Plutarch (c. 29, 11 sqq.) continues as follows :

“ Οὐ μὲν ἐδόκει μαρτυρεῖν ὁ Κικέρων διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα Τερεντίαν ἀπολογούμενος. Ἦν γὰρ αὐτῇ πρὸς τὸν Κλώδιον ἀπέχθεια διὰ τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐκείνου Κλωδίαν, ὥς τῷ Κικέρωνι βουλομένην γαμηθῆναι καὶ τοῦτο διὰ Τύλλου τινὸς (Cod. Mat. add. Ταραντίνου) πράττουσαν, ὥς ἐταῖρος μὲν ἦν καὶ συνήθης ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Κικέρωνος, αἰεὶ δὲ πρὸς Κλωδίαν φοιτῶν καὶ θεραπεύων ἐγγὺς οἰκοῦσαν ὑποφίαν τῇ Τερεντίᾳ παρέσχε.”

The particular cause here assigned to this famous feud, which was destined to prove so disastrous to Cicero, is not found elsewhere. There are, however, as may be remarked in passing, strong grounds for believing Suetonius to have been Plutarch's source of information.¹

About ten years ago, the late Charles Graux found a Greek MS at Madrid which contained a number of Plutarch's Lives, among them those of Demosthenes and Cicero. An accurate collation of this MS,² designated as Cod. N or Cod. Matritensis, having brought to light a few variants undoubtedly superior to the received text, Graux, superlatively elated at his discovery, at once jumped to the conclusion that this Madrid MS represented a more reliable and authoritative text than the codices of Plutarch hitherto known, and, true to this conviction, he did not hesitate to make the MS in question the basis of an edition of the Lives of Cicero and Demosthenes (Hachette, Paris, 1887, 1889).

It were an extremely easy task to show that Graux greatly exaggerated the value of his new MS. At present, however, we are chiefly concerned with the following reading in the passage just quoted in full. Cod. N: διὰ Θύλλου (sic!) τινὸς Ταραντίνου; libri nostri ad unum omnes: διὰ Τύλλου (or Τούλλου) τινὸς.

¹ Cf. the author's article on a "New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero" (Transact. of Am. Phil. Ass. Vol. XX, p. 139 sqq.)

² Revue de Philologie, Vol. V 1.

I shall endeavor to prove, in the first place, that the addition *Ταραντίου* is an interpolation, on the ground that the Codex Matritensis, however acceptable some of its variants may be, is *altogether untrustworthy in its proper names*. The spuriousness of the *Ταραντίου* once demonstrated, the way will be clear for an emendation, the presentation of which is the primary object and only excuse for the publication of this paper.

As Graux evidently regarded the text of the Dem. and Cic. as best representative of the character of his new MS, I shall draw my examples from these vitae only.

Vita Cic. c. XXVII 29: Cod. N—ἀκυλίων pro ἀκύλλιον.

Id. c. XXXVI 16—Καὶ κιλίου pro Καιλίου.

Id. c. XLVII 9—καὶ ἦτας pro Καίητας (καπίτας).

Comp. Dem. et Cic. I 14—Κεκιλίου pro Καιλίου.

Dem. c. 25 ad fin.—Θεόφραστος pro Θεόπομπος without any apparent reason, in spite of Graux' vigorous defence.

In Dem. c. V 11 Plutarch quotes Hermippos, the well known writer and pupil of Callimachus, as his authority for the statement that Demosthenes had been a hearer of Plato ("Ερμιππος δέ φησιν). Now the scribe of the Cod. N, or one of his predecessors, remembering in an evil hour that there existed also a poet of the old Attic comedy by that name, calmly inserted ὁ ποιητής, which, of course, renders the whole passage most ridiculous.¹

In Dem. c. X 14 sqq. Theophrastus is quoted for two anecdotes, the second being very properly introduced by the words ὁ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος. This reading apparently did not satisfy the rigid demands for perspicuity made by our learned scribe, for he felt himself called upon to write ὁ αὐτὸς Θεόφραστος.

In a passage of the Vita Ciceronis c. 36 ad fin., the interpolator is caught in flagrante delicto, as it were. The biographer, after having narrated Cicero's campaign in Cilicia, concludes by saying, that after remaining some days in Athens, on his way home, he returned to Rome, where all things were just as in a flame (. . . "εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπανῆλθεν, ἤδη τῶν πραγμάτων ὥσπερ ὑπὸ φλεγμονῆς ἀφισταμένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον"). Now these words are almost a literal translation of a passage in one of Cicero's letters, relating to the identical circumstance (Ad fam. XVI 11: "*ego ad urbem accessi sed incidi in ipsam flammam civilis dis-*

¹ Schenkl's conjecture (Bursian Jahresber. 1884, p. 218), ὀπήγοι, cannot be defended except on purely apologetic grounds. The same applies to Graux' ποτέ τισιν.

cordiae vel potius belli"). All our MSS correctly write πόλιν; the copyist of N, however, rashly substituted εἰς Ῥώμην, not dreaming that the πόλιν is an excusable Latinism, occasioned by a too literal translation of the well known idiom which makes urbs = Roma. A few lines previous, where Plutarch is not translating, εἰς Ῥώμην is used very properly.

A still more flagrant instance of this copyist's untrustworthiness in the matter of proper names is furnished by Dem. c. 23 ad fin. The Codex N here reads Φωκίων in place of Δημάδης. The correction is so manifestly impossible that the context would have imperatively demanded the restoration of Δημάδης, even if all our MSS had been unanimously in favor of the reading Φωκίων, as the most cursory perusal of the passage in question will show:

"Βουλευομένων δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ διαπορούντων ὁ Δημάδης λαβὼν πέντε τάλαντα παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡμολόγησε πρεσβεύσειν καὶ δεήσεσθαι τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, εἴτε τῇ φιλίᾳ πιστεύων, εἴτε προσδοκῶν μεστὸν εὐρήσειν ὥσπερ λέοντα φόνου κεκορεσμένον. Ἐπεισε δ' οὖν καὶ παρητήσατο τοὺς ἄνδρας ὁ Δημάδης [Cod. Mat. Φωκίων!] καὶ διήλλαξεν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν."

As in the similar case of Ἑρμιππος ὁ ποιητής, quoted above, the semi-learned librarius probably remembered having read somewhere that Phocion had also been one of the members of this embassy, and accordingly inserted his name in place of Demades, either with a view to displaying his learning or, what appears even more likely, because he wished to give the credit and honor of so eminently successful a mission to Phocion as the worthier man of the two, for upon your monkish scribes such ancient paragons of virtue as Aristides and Phocion were sure to exert a particular fascination.

Finally, I adduce Dem. c. 14, 23. In this paragraph, Theopompus, according to our MSS, is quoted for a statement which is in the highest degree complimentary to Demosthenes. The Cod. Mat., however, again writes Θεόφραστος. As Graux (l. c. p. 47) takes special pains to show that here his Madrid MS has preserved the original reading, it will be necessary to dwell upon this point somewhat more in detail. His chief argument in favor of the new variant seems to be that Theopompus, being a most bigoted partisan of Macedon, would scarcely have said anything so complimentary of Philip's greatest opponent. The assertion, however, that blind partisanship necessarily incapacitates an author from doing justice to a great opponent by occasionally chronicling a noble trait of his character is absurd. It is, more-

over, sufficiently refuted in the case of Theopompus by three passages in the Life of Demosthenes,¹ and is primarily the result of a most profound misconception of Theopompus' character. For if the historian had really been the man Graux assumes him to have been, how then, I ask, are we to explain away the statement of Polybius² that Theopompus had also attacked his great hero, the Macedonian Philip, for the extreme laxity of his morals? Surely the historian who did not shrink from upbraiding the mightiest man of his own party cannot have been constitutionally incapable of occasionally praising a great opponent.

But even supposing for a moment such to have been the case, it was certainly incumbent upon Graux to show that if the reading *Θεόπομπος* is wrong, that of *Θεόφραστος* is pre-eminently right. He did not, however, even so much as attempt to do this. As a matter of fact, it is so far from being the case that the critic would actually have found himself compelled to decide in favor of the accepted reading, if our MSS had been divided upon this point instead of being altogether unanimous. For if Theopompus was partial to Macedon, this was unquestionably true, in no less degree, of Theophrastus, the pupil and life-long friend of Aristotle, who throughout all his voluminous writings has never so much as an allusion to Demosthenes, not even in his Rhetoric, although this work, as Dionysius³ has clearly demonstrated, was published when the fame of the orator had long been established. And if we further add that among the pupils of Theophrastus, himself a friend of Antipater, there were not a few who openly espoused the Macedonian cause, while his greatest pupil, Demetrius Phalereus, actually governed Athens for ten years in the interest of Cassander, we will not be inclined to attribute to the teacher any pronounced love of Athenian democracy. On the contrary, Theophrastus had, if anything, which cannot be said of Theopompus, ample grounds for cherishing a decided resentment against an immediate descendant of Demosthenes, the well known Demochares. In the year 306, one Sophocles succeeded in carrying a law that no one of the philosophers, on penalty of death, should preside over a school unless the council and the people had passed a resolution sanctioning his doing so.⁴

¹ Cf. ch. 3, 18. 23; 21, 14.

² VIII 11.

³ Dionysius, Ep. ad Amm. c. XI sqq.

⁴ Cf. Diog. Laert. V 38; Pollux, IX 42; Athen. XIII 610e; Wilamowitz, Antigonos, p. 270.

Theophrastus, fearing for his life, fled from Athens. Sophocles was a year later accused *παράνομον*, and his defence, though unsuccessful, was undertaken by none other than the above-mentioned nephew of Demosthenes. If additional evidence were needed to show that Theophrastus cannot have been particularly well disposed toward the greatest of Athenian orators, it is furnished by two passages of Plutarch's biography (c. 10, 14 sqq.), in one of which the philosopher is reported to have given his preference to the notorious Demades as against the patriotic Demosthenes. Other things, therefore, being equal, the reading of the Madrid MS cannot possibly command our approval, even if it were more strongly supported by MS authority than it is.¹ In fact, the examples which have been adduced possess sufficient argumentative validity to justify the contention that *we are not at liberty to accept as genuine any proper name if found only in the Codex Matritensis, unless it can be demonstrated by internal evidence of an overwhelming nature that the reading of our other MSS is altogether untenable*, and hence we conclude that inasmuch as no such evidence can be found in favor of the *Ταραντίνου*, it must unhesitatingly be rejected as an interpolation.² What may have prompted the scribe to make the addition in question cannot, of course, be asserted with confidence. I am, however, strongly inclined to believe that it owed its origin to a dittography of the *τινός*, a conjectural effort at all events not unworthy of him who inserted *ὁ ποιητής* and *Φωκίων*.

The *Ταραντίνου* being disposed of, I may now take up the reading of our MSS, *διὰ Τόλλου τινός*. This individual is absolutely unknown to us, and yet we might suppose that the writer of this recondite piece of family history might have been more definite as regards the name of this accommodating postillon d'amour, instead of still further evaporating him, as it were, by an addi-

¹ The error was an easy one, as the names of Theophrastus and Theopompus are frequently confounded; cf. *Vita Dem.* c. 25; *Diog. Laert.* V 126.

² Perhaps an additional argument for the spuriousness of *Ταραντίνου* may be derived from the fact that he is called *Τόλλος*, it being rather improbable that a Tarantine should rejoice in so old, so patrician, and above all so rare a cognomen. For with the exception of Tullus Hostilius and Attius Tullus (provided Attius Tullius be not the proper form here), it seems to occur only in the family of the Volcatii (*Cic. ad Att.* VIII 9, 3 et saepius) and in one Cluilius Tullus mentioned by *Cic. Phil.* IX 2, 4, 5, while in the *entire C. I. L.* we meet with it but *four times* and once as a praenomen; cf. *C. I. L.* V 7545, 2; VII [794] 1336, 1136; VIII 2556, 4, and I 1120-21 (Tullus Tullius).

tional *τινός*. Some such reflection may have induced Xylander, one of the first editors of Plutarch, to conjecture *Τυλλίου* for *Τύλλου*, in order that, as he says, "*libertus aliquis Ciceronis intellegatur.*" This conjecture is, however, altogether improbable, as might easily be demonstrated by the very context of the passage, but even if we read *Τυλλίου*, we should be simply substituting the name of one unknown individual for another equally unknown. Nevertheless, all subsequent editors, although they were careful not to receive Xylander's emendation into their texts, have without exception given it a place in their critical annotations. As this was scarcely done out of any respect for the "manes" of the old critic, which would have been altogether too touching and unique a phenomenon in the history of philology, it must be taken as a sort of tacit indication that all editors of Plutarch instinctively felt something to be wrong, but hitting upon no satisfactory remedy they left the text undisturbed.

Now I venture to suggest that Plutarch wrote *διὰ Κατ'ύλλον*, and not *διὰ Τύλλον*, as all our MSS have it. From a palaeographical point of view the emendation is so ridiculously simple as scarcely to deserve the name of a correction. The corruption arose out of a *ditlography* in a *minuscule MS.* The archetypon had it *διακατυλλον*. This very easily became *διαιατυλλον*, the confusion between *ι*, *κ* and *τ* in minuscule writing being notoriously frequent, in fact they cannot be distinguished in nine cases out of ten, the sense alone determining which letter was intended. Now a later scribe simply omitted the apparently superfluous *ια*, and this the more readily as he could never have suspected that the name of Catullus lurked beneath the corruption, the works of this poet having been quite unknown throughout the middle ages. On the other hand, *διὰ Τύλλον* had a genuine Roman ring to it, and in consequence could not but prove acceptable to subsequent copyists. But if the emendation just proposed commends itself by reason of its remarkable palaeographical simplicity, it receives most weighty additional confirmation from the *context* itself. In the first place, Cicero and Catullus are known to have been acquainted, as is demonstrated by the famous eucharisticon (Carmen 49) of the poet, for I have never been able to find any really plausible reason for regarding the poem as ironical. Again, Plutarch is speaking of events which took place about the year 62 B. C., and curiously enough this is the very year which is generally assigned by scholars to Catullus' arrival in Rome and to the beginning of his

acquaintance with the lady whom he immortalized in his poems. It was perhaps by some such service as that spoken of by Plutarch that he ingratiated himself into Lesbia's favor. But, be this a mere fancy, the coincidences just pointed out are altogether too remarkable to be attributable to mere accident, and, when added to the simplicity of the correction itself, are well calculated to make the emendation proposed all but certain.

If the outcome of this whole discussion had been nothing but the restoration of a genuine reading to the text of Plutarch it were indeed much ado about nothing. This is, however, far from being the case, for with the acceptance of my emendation the famous controversy as to the identity of Catullus' Lesbia and Clodia is once for all decided in favor of the affirmative, for, while the testimony of Apuleius and the inference drawn from the Lesbius Pulcher, mentioned by the poet (Carm. 79, 1), furnished, after all, but circumstantial though very strong evidence in proof of this identity, we now find Catullus for the *first time* brought into direct and, as it were, historical connection with Clodia as her lover.

A. GUDEMAN.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

V.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDA.

SECOND SERIES.

The series of six Vedic studies here offered continues the work commenced in the article entitled 'Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda,' A. J. Ph. vii. 466-88. The circumstance which characterizes and binds together both series is the constant attention to the ritual practices which accompanies the recital of the hymns. The present series differs from the first in that it is not restricted to the Atharva-Veda, but includes some studies—notably the fifth—in which it is made manifest that the mantras of the other Vedas may obtain such illumination from the practices in which they were enveloped, as to render the interpreter dependent upon these for the understanding of the hymns.

Unquestionably much help in the exegesis of the Vedas may be expected from this quarter: a single touch in the practice may crystallize into plain, tangible reality some effusion which seems without it vague, nebulous, or apparently even nonsensical. There is, too, no doubt in the mind of the writer but what this side of Vedic study—the study of the antiquities, the 'realien'—has been unduly neglected. The charge which is brought against Vedic interpreters with greatest frequency and predilection is that their translations are vaguely general, offering not infrequently a more or less unintelligible jingle of words in the place of plain sense. We may not hope to remove this difficulty with the aid of ritualistic studies alone, but it is believed that such studies will assume a place of growing importance in the workshop of the Vedic student, and that they will contribute largely to set aside the justice of this accusation. The ritualistic employment of the hymns is often very external, often very symbolic and secondary, but it is frequently also very direct. And even the most secondary application of a mantra-passage may be suggestive: the very error in viewing the hymn—conscious or unconscious on the part of the Vedic priest—may yield that subtle suggestion which renders clear the sense of a passage previously considered as pregnant with obscure and complicated sentiment—a condition which

we may regard with growing certainty as indicating every time that a given passage is simply misunderstood. The writer bespeaks for this second series a reception as friendly as that which was accorded to the first, and hopes that his methods may incite others to avail themselves of the valuable tools for the exegesis of the mantras which are stored away in the works of the brāhmaṇa and sūtra literature.

I.

On the jāyānya-charm, AV. vii. 76. 3-5, and the apacit-hymns (vi. 83; vii. 74. 1-2; vii. 76. 1-2) of the Atharva-Veda.¹

The charm directed against the *jāyānya*, AV. vii. 76. 3 fg. is, in difficulty of explanation, not surpassed by any hymn of the AV. The Pet. Lex., and Böhtlingk in the abridged lexicon of the Petersburg Academy, gloss the word simply by 'eine bestimmte krankheit.' Adalbert Kuhn, in Kuhn's Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, xiii. 155, and Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 377, regard it as identical with a disease called *jāyēnya* in TS. ii. 3. 5. 1-3; 5. 6. 4-5; the *jāyēnya* is there mentioned in connection with diseases called *yakṣma* (*rājayakṣmā*, *pāpayakṣmā*, etc.), which are currently believed to be designations of consumption. Ludwig, Der Rig-Veda iii. pp. 342, 500, explains it as being directed against poisonous insects. In translating the hymn, I shall for the present leave *jāyānya* untranslated, as also the second half of stanza 4, containing the word *akṣita* which has hitherto been misunderstood by the translators.

3. 'The *jāyānya*, which crushes the bones of the back, which penetrates the *talidya*, also whatever one is fixed upon the head, every one I have driven out.'

5. 'We know, O *jāyānya*, thy origin, whence thou didst spring; how canst thou strike here, in whose house we offer oblations?'

The fourth verse begins: 'The *jāyānya*, furnished with wings, flies, he settles down upon man'; the second half of the stanza reads: *tād akṣitasya bheṣajām ubhāyoh sūkṣatasya ca*. The Petersburg lexicons, and Whitney in the Index, read *akṣitasya* without emending; the former translate the word by 'unverletzt,' which yields no clear meaning, when applied to the passage: 'this is the

¹ Presented to the American Oriental Society at its meeting, October, 1887.

² For the explanation of *talidya* and *nīr āstam* of the MSS of the vulgate see the next number of this series.

remedy for him who is not injured (?) and also for him who is injured.' Both Zimmer and Ludwig recognize the antithetical character of *d-kṣitasya* and *sū-kṣatasya*, and they emend each in a different direction: Ludwig reads *sūkṣitasya* to correspond to *dkṣitasya*, Zimmer *dkṣatasya* to correspond to *sūkṣatasya*. Ludwig then translates: 'das ist das mittel gegen den nicht festsitzenden, und auch gegen den festsitzenden.' Zimmer finds support for his reading *dkṣatasya*, and at the same time for his theory that the charm is directed against a kind of consumption, in the word *kṣata*, which is reported by Wise in his 'Commentary on the Hindu system of medicine,' p. 321, to have the special value of 'rupture, or ulcer of the respiratory organs.' Zimmer translates accordingly: 'hier habe ich ein heilmittel für den menschen, der den *kṣata* noch nicht hat und den, der schwer an ihm erkrankt ist.'

The ritual offers us a suggestion which points in a very different direction. In the Kāuṣika-sūtra 31. 11, and in Dārila's comment to Kāuṣ. 32. 11, 13, we find mention of a disease called *akṣata*. The phrase *akṣatabhāiṣajyam*, which Dārila employs, can have but one value, that of 'remedy for *akṣata*.' Moreover, the passage 32. 11 fg., which is entitled by Dārila *akṣatabhāiṣajyam*, describes the ritual connected with the charm under discussion. We are left, however, to find the real character of the disease by implication from the practices reported in the ritual. The clearest passage is Kāuṣ. 31. 11 fg.:

11. *idam id vā ity akṣatam mūtrapphenenā 'bhyudya.*

Dārila: *mānuṣamūtrapphenena aruṇḍuṇ (?) kledayati* 'while reciting the hymn AV. vi. 57 he moistens the *akṣata* with the urine of a human being.'

12. *prakṣipati.* Dārila: *tato mūtram prakṣipati pāṇinā* 'he throws the urine with his hand (upon the *akṣata*).'

13. *dantarajasā 'vadegdhi.* Dārila: *dantamalinā* "limpaty *akṣatam* 'he smears the *akṣata* with the scourings from teeth.'

Much less simple and clear is the ritual connected with the *jāyānya*-charm, Kāuṣ. 32. 11 fg.:

11. *yaḥ kikasā iti piṣṭilavīṇātantrīm badhnāti.* Dārila: *piṣṭilavīṇā tasyās tantrīm badhnāti, akṣatabhāiṣajyam.*

12. *tantryā kṣitikām.* Dārila: *tasyā* (Cod. *tarasyā*) *vīṇāyāḥ kṣitikāntayāi 'va tantryā badhnāti kṣitikārabhasyopari tṛṇaḍamkha-* (! for *-khaṇḍa-*?) *rohyādanārthaḥ (?)*.

13. *vīriṇavadhrīm svayammlānaḥ triḥ samasya.* Dārila: *badhnāti, akṣatabhāiṣajyam.*

The practice described in Kāuṣ. 31. 11 fg. is clear in one regard : it refers to some external trouble ; and we are certainly not too bold if we allow the obvious etymology of *akṣata* 'not cut, not wounded,' to guide us. The assumption that *akṣata* means 'a tumor, boil,' or the like, not caused by a weapon, seems almost unavoidable as far as the ritual is concerned.¹

The same result, in a less severely technical form, must be applied to the passage of the AV. under discussion. It is to be translated as follows, after emending *akṣitasya* to *akṣatasya* :

'Here is a remedy both for (boils or sores) not caused by cutting, as well as for wounds sharply cut.' And there seems to be no ground to doubt the intelligence of the Sutra, when it states that the hymn was directed against such a disease as tumors. We are thus led to identify *jāyānya* with *akṣata*, or at least we are justified in believing that the *jāyānya* refers to some external skin disease.

Ludwig's interpretation of the *jāyānya*-charm, as being directed against an obnoxious insect of that name, evidently rests upon two grounds. First, the statement in the fourth verse: *pakṣī jāyānyaḥ paṭati śā ā viṣati pūruṣam*, which he translates 'der vogel Jāyānya fliegt, und komt in den menschen hinein.'

The sentence has been translated above more literally, 'the *jāyānya*, furnished with wings, flies, he settles down upon man'; and it is evident that a disease which manifests itself externally may easily have been conceived as having flown on to the body. It will appear below that similar expressions have given rise to what I cannot but regard as an erroneous explanation of the *apacit*-hymns.

An absolutely certain case in which disease, not insects, is conceived as flying forth when it leaves the body, is contained in RV. x. 97. 13: *sākdāṁ yakṣma prā pata cāṣeṇa kikiḍvīnā sākdāṁ vātasya dhrājyā* 'O *yakṣma*, fly forth, fly with the blue jay, fly with the current of the wind'; cf. KZ. xiii. 70.

Secondly, the first part of the hymn is actually devoted to a charm against the *apacit*, which Ludwig, together with all other interpreters, also believes to refer to noxious insects. This brings us to the second part of our enquiry.

¹ This explanation was advanced by the author in the P. A. O. S. for Oct. 1887 (Journal, vol. xiii. p. ccxvii), before he had access to the paddhati of Keçava. The latter says. at Kāuṣ. 31. 11: *akṣitavranabhāiṣajyam ucyate . . . yasya vranasya mukham nā 'sti, akṣitaduṣṭavranā bhāiṣajyam*. See also Keç. at 31. 15; 32. 11 fg.

The AV. contains three charms against *apacit*: vi. 83; vii. 74. 1, 2; and vii. 76. 1, 2, the first part of the hymn just discussed. Aside from these passages, the word *apacit* is referred to incidentally in vi. 25; it does not occur in any other Samhitā in this form. The two Petersburg lexicons, Kuhn in KZ. xiii. 155, Ludwig in Rig-Veda iii. 342, 500, Zimmer in Altindisches Leben 54, 97, and Florenz in Bezzenberger's Beiträge xii. 280, regard the *apacit* as a certain noxious insect. The internal evidence of the hymns, which seems at first sight to make for such an interpretation, is as follows. In vi. 83 the *apacit* are called upon to fly away: vi. 83. 1, *āpacitaḥ prā patata suparṇo vasatēr iva*, 'fly away, O ye *apacit*, as a bird from its nest'; vi. 83. 2, *asūtikā rāmāyany āpacit prā patisyati glāur itaḥ prā patisyati*, 'the *apacit*, the daughter of the black one, without bearing offspring, shall fly away; the *glāu* (Pet. Lexicons and Zimmer, 'the boil'; Ludwig, 'the owl') shall fly away.' It is to be noted that these passages regard *apacit* from a point of view converse to that from which *jāyānya* is viewed in vii. 76. 4: 'the *jāyānya*, winged, flies, he settles down upon man.' The *jāyānya* is depicted in the act of coming on before the exorcism has been performed; the *apacit*, as going away after the potent influences have been set to work. Ludwig consistently regards one and the other as referring to insects; Zimmer sees insects in the *apacit*, consumption in the *jāyānya*.

Aside from these passages, there is but one phrase, not at all free from obscurity, in vi. 25, which can be employed to support this view of the *apacit*:

1. *Pāṇca ca yāḥ pañcāṣṭac ca saṁyānti mānyā abhi, itāḥ tāḥ sārva naṣyantu vākā āpacitām iva.*
2. *Sāpta ca yāḥ saptaṭiṣ ca saṁyānti grātvā abhi, itāḥ tāḥ, etc.*
3. *Nāva ca yāḥ navatṭiṣ ca saṁyānti skāndhyā abhi, itāḥ tāḥ, etc.*

'The five and fifty which assemble upon the back of the head, let them pass away from here *vākā āpacitām iva*.'

Kuhn, in KZ. xiii. 130, translates: 'wie die schwärme der apacits.' The Petersburg lexicons, and Florenz ibid. translate: 'as the buzzing of the apacits,' a translation supported only by the supposed etymology of the word (root *vac*), aside from the preconceived notion that the *apacit* are insects. The stem *vākā* occurs nowhere else in the meaning 'buzzing'; it means 'formula, recitation,' and the like.

Against this feeble testimony the remaining context of the hymns themselves protests most emphatically. I claim for *apacit*

the meaning of 'sore, pustule, boil,' or the like. AV. vii. 76. 1, 2 is to be translated somewhat as follows:

1. 'The *apacit*, which are more evil than the evil ones (i. e. the most virulent), those which are drier than the *sehu* (an obscure designation for a part of the human body, mentioned in the Kāthakasāmhita 34. 12 along with the spleen, *sehu ca plihā ca*: Ludwig translates it by 'harz'), those which are moister than salt, these fall off more easily than the easily falling one (i. e. fall off most easily; read perhaps, in accordance with the demands of the metre, *ā susrdsah susrastarāh?*).

2. 'The *apacit* which are upon the neck, and those which are upon the breast, and those which are upon the *vijāman* (Ludwig, 'knöchel'; Pet. Lex., 'members of the body which are in pairs'), fall off by themselves.'

The implication in both verses is that the *apacit* will fall off easily owing to the potency of the charm. Surely there can be no insects implied; difficult as it may be to imagine that there are insects which are drier than the *sehu* and moister than salt, the applicability of such adjectives to sores or boils is very palpable. The subdivision of flying insects into such as belong to the neck, to the breast, etc., is also extremely doubtful, but most natural in the case of different phases of some skin-disease.

AV. vii. 74. 1, 2 may be translated as follows:

1. 'We have heard it said that the mother of the black *apacit* is red; with the root found by the divine sage do I strike all these.

2. 'I strike the foremost one of them, and I strike also the middlemost one of them; this hindmost one I cut off like (i. e. as easily as) a bunch of hair.'

And AV. vi. 83:

1. 'Fly away, O ye *apacit*, as a bird from the nest; may the sun effect a remedy; may the moon shine you away.

2. 'One is variegated, one is white, one is black, and two are red; I have caught the names of all of them. Go away, ye slayers of men.

3. 'The *apacit*, the daughter of the black one, without bearing offspring, will fly away; the boil will fly away, the *galunta* (swelling?)¹ will perish.'

¹ Wise, p. 311, has, "*Gilin*. The swelling in this disease is like the swelling of a plum, not painful, but hard; and is produced by diseased phlegm, and blood." Or is this rather *gilāyu* 'a hard boil in the throat'? see Pet. Lex. sub voce.

Here the manifestation of a certain kind of insect in so many different colors is improbable; at the best it would be necessary to see in the name *apacit* a very generic term for insects. On the other hand, the emphatic mention of different colors—black, red, white, variegated—is a likely product of even superficial observation in the case of skin-diseases, and is paralleled by i. 23, a charm directed against *kilāsa*, leprosy or the like:

1. 'By night thou didst grow, O plant, thou sable one, dark one, black one; do thou, who art full of color, stain the leprous, gray spot?

2. 'Drive away from here what is leprous and gray, and also what is variegated; may your own color settle down upon you, and cause the white spots to fly away.'

In the ritual to i. 23 and 24 (Kāuṣ. 26. 22 fg.), after dung has been rubbed upon the discolored spot until it becomes red, the sores are cut off: 22. *naktamjātā suparṇo jāta iti mantroktam* (Dārila: *ṣvitram*, Cod. *svitram*) *ṣakṛd ā lohitaṁ* (Dār. *ṣāval lohitaṁ ṣvitrasthānam* [Cod. *svitra*-] *āgataṁ*) *praghr̥ṣyā* "limpati. 23. *palitāny āchidyā*. With this last phrase we may compare directly the pāda *ā chinadmi stūkām iva* in the *apacit*-hymn (vii. 74. 2^a).

We are not favored by the ritualistic writings of the AV. with a distinct explanation of the term *apacit*.¹ But an unbiased application of the statement of the sūtra will not fail to corroborate the interpretation which is here advanced. Kāuṣ. 31. 16 fg. rubricates two of the *apacit*-hymns: 16. *apacita ā susrasa iti kiṁstyādini* 'with the two hymns vi. 83 and vii. 76 he applies the performances which begin with the use of the shell.' Kāuṣ. 30. 16 tells what these performances are: *kiṁstyā-ṣvajāmbilo-dakarakṣikā-maṣakādibhyām* (!) *dañṣayati*. 'He rubs (the place) with (moisture from a) shell (Dārila: *kiṁstyah ṣaṅkhaḥ*, . . . *kiṁstyenā* "lepanam), smears it with the saliva of a dog, then subjects it to the bite of leeches, gnats, etc. (? Dārila: *udakarakṣikā jalūkādigrhakolikā*). Kāuṣ. 31. 17 continues: *lohitalavaṇam saṁkṣudyā* 'bhiniṣṭhivati. Dārila: *sāindhavalavaṇam cūrṇikṛtyā* 'paciti kṛtvā tam abhimukhe niṣṭhivet. 'Having ground up rock-salt, having placed it upon the *apacit*, he spits against that (salt).'

The entire treatment seems to be in accordance with modern ideas of therapeutics. The boil is softened by mucous applica-

¹ Keçava's paddhati does explain the term very directly by *gaṇḍamālā*; see 31. 16 fg.; 32. 8 fg.

tions, then leeches are applied, after which a sort of poultice of ground rock-salt, rendered soft and pulpy by saliva, is placed upon the opening, for astringent purposes.

The ritual which the Sūtras present for vii. 74 is less pointed, but certainly contains nothing which militates against our view. The passage is Kāuṣ. 32. 8 sg.: 8. *apacitām iti vāṇavena dārbhyūṣeṇa* (var. -*ūṣeṇa*) *kṛṣṇorṇājyena kālābundāi stukāgrāir iti mantroktam*. Dārila: *dhanuṣādorbhyaṣaṇa* (! for *dhanuṣā dārbhyūṣeṇa* ?) *darbhavikārā darbhiraṅguḥ . . . kṛṣṇorṇā jyā yasya tasya tat . . . tena dhanuṣā kālābundāir bundā iṣavaḥ tāiḥ kṛṣṇavarṇāiḥ stukāgrāiḥ, ūrṇāstukāgrāi stukā jaṭo 'cyate tāir mantroktam vidhyati, apacitam ity arthaḥ*.

9. *caturthyā 'bhinidhāyā 'bhividhyati*.

10. *jyāstukājvālena*. Dārila: *jyāyā stukayā 'vajvālaḥ . . . tena avasiṅcati apacitam*.

Here the practice is rather symbolical than therapeutical. With black arrows, which have flakes of wool tied to their points (cf. vii. 74. 2^a: *chinadmi stukām iva*) and which are shot from a bow made of reed, furnished with a *dārbhyūṣa* (? *darbhiraṅguḥ*) and with a bowstring made of black wool, he strikes the *apacit* (cf. vii. 74. 2: *vidhyāmy āsām prathamām*, etc.). With the fourth (verse of the hymn ?), having laid on (an arrow ?), he hits against the *apacit*. Finally he washes it off with a lotion produced by heating the bowstring and dipping it into water, which is thus made warm; cf. Kāuṣ. 27. 29 and 33.

In support of this explanation I am fortunately able to bring the authority of the medical Cāstras, which seems to have escaped the eyes of the earlier interpreters of *apacit*. Wise, in his digest of Hindu medicine—a work whose value would be increased manifold if it were provided with an index of its countless names of diseases, plants, and remedies—has a most significant passage bearing upon this point on p. 315:

“Scrofulous swellings (*Gandamālā*).

“When many small tumors like plums appear in the axilla, neck, back, and groins (!), they are produced by diseased fat and phlegm. They suppurate slowly, and continue to appear and suppurate for a long period, when it is called *Apachī* (!).”

Some of the features of the treatment are worthy of notice for their coincidence with the practice of the sūtras:

“Different *fomentations* . . . and *poultices* are applied, and

when they (i. e. the tumors) suppurate, open, and discharge the matter, wash the wound with a decoction of *bilwa*, etc. . . . A poultice made of *tila*, and the leaves of the castor-oil tree *mixed with salt*, and applied to the part (!) . . . When the disease is produced by bile, *apply leeches*."

After this exposition of the nature of the disease, we need hardly beg indulgence for the following etymology. Kuhn, KZ. xiii. 155, explains the word as 'die abmagernden (sc. insecten).' The first value of root *ci* with *apa* in the Pet. Lex. is 'ablesen,' 'pick off.' The disease seems to be viewed as 'an act of scaling or paring off' the foreign excrescences on the body. We may compare semasiologically Lat. *scabies*, *scabere*, Germ. *die schabe*, *schaben*, Engl. *scab*.

At VS. xii. 97 we find mention of the disease *upacit* in juxtaposition with *balāsa*, *dr̥ṣas*, etc. I make no doubt that this is the same disease with its name altered by a popular etymology, which is probably felt correctly by Mahīdhara, when he glosses thus: *upacinvarianti ṣarīraṁ vardhayanti 'ty upacitaḥ* '(they are called) *upacit*, because they cover over the body and cause it to swell.'

Returning now to the hymn AV. vi. 25, in which the *apacit* are mentioned incidentally, we find that the translators have failed to define its purpose sufficiently. Kuhn, KZ. xiii. 128, treats the hymn under the head of 'Sieben und siebzigerlei krankheit'; he compares it with Germanic formulas directed against fever and other diseases, which are often described as being of seventy-seven varieties. Florenz, in Bezz. Beiträge xii. 281, does not feel quite certain that the charm is directed against disease at all, but thinks it possible that some febrile disease, accompanied by eruptions, is in question. There is, however, no indication, either in the hymn or in its ritual, of the presence of fever in connection with the disease. The hymn simply states that the fifty-five which are upon the back of the head, and the seventy-seven which are upon the neck, and the ninety-nine which are upon the shoulders, shall pass away. The ritual is clearly directed against a disease similar to the *apacit*, a kind of boil or tumor. Kāuṣ. 30. 14 fg. is as follows:

14. *pañca ca yā iti pañca pañcāṣatam paraṣuparnān kṣāṭhāir ādīpayati*. 'With AV. vi. 25 he kindles by means of pieces of wood fifty-five palāṣa-leaves, which have the form of an axe.

15. *kapāle praṣṭam* (Dār. *parṇarasam*) *kṣāṭhenā 'limpati*. 'The sap of the leaves which has boiled forth from the leaves he smears upon the tumor.'

16. Continues with the same process which figures prominently in the treatment of the *apacit*, the smearing with the fluid from a shell, etc., as described above.

Neither the sūtras nor Dārila, however, report anything directly about the symptoms or the name of the disease.¹ I believe, however, that a part of the deficiency can be supplied from the Čāstras. Wise, *ibid.* p. 316, reads as follows:

"Tumors of the neck (*Manskunder*).

"Is a variety of the Gandamālā or scrofulous swellings. They are hard and large, and when they suppurate they should be opened. After which the cavity is to be cleaned with astringent washes."

The suggestion that '*manskunder*' veils the words *mānyā* and *skāndhyā* contained in this hymn will scarcely fail to gain assent. It would seem perhaps too that we must supply with the words *mānyā*, *grāivya*, *skāndhyā* some word having the meaning of 'tumor' or the like, not 'sinews' or 'muscles,' as the previous translations have done. To such a construction points also the statement of the Anukramaṇi, *pañca ca yā iti mantroktamanyāvināṣanadevatyam*.

The word *vākā* in the refrain, *vākā apacitām iva*, is translated by Kuhn as 'swarms (of *apacit*)'; by the Pet. Lexicons and Florenz, as 'buzzing.' With the change of attitude towards the hymn which is here recommended, neither of these translations is acceptable. As it seems impossible to retain the word, we may perhaps resort to an emendation based upon the well-known confusion in the MSS of *v* and *p*.² we read *pākā apacitām iva* 'may they (the tumors) pass away like the pustules of the *apacit*.' The implication would then be that the tumors in question are 'hard and large' (Wise, *ibid.*), and that the *apacit* are more easily brought to the point of breaking open.

II.

On the ἀπ. λεγ. talīdyā, AV. vii. 76. 3.³

In the preceding article we endeavored to explain AV. vii. 76; in the third stanza of the hymn certain words were left undiscussed. To these we now return.

¹ Keçava, however, says outright: *atha ganḍamālābhāṣajyam ucyate* (30. 14).

² Cf. *upolava* and *upolapa*, Kāuṣika-sūtra, introduction, p. xlviii.

³ Presented to the A. O. S. at its meeting, October, 1890.

yāḥ kikasāḥ praçṛṇāti talidyaṁ avatiṣṭhati
nir āstam sārvaṁ jāyānyaṁ yāḥ káçca kakúdi çritāḥ.

As *jāyānya* is masculine, *sārvaṁ jāyānyaṁ* are accusatives, and Whitney's hesitating emendation to *nirastam* 'has been expelled,' is unacceptable. See Index Verborum to the AV. p. 43^a. I emend to *nir āstham*, first person singular of the aorist of that root *asth* whose existence Pischel has recently established in the Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen of June 20, 1890, Nr. 13, p. 530 fg.; *nir āstham . . . jāyānyam*, 'I have driven out the *jāyānya*,' is a perfect pendant to *vy āsthan (vi āsthat) mīdhaḥ*, 'he has driven apart the enemy,' AV. xiii. 1. 5, and *mīdha evā vy āsthata*, 'the enemy he has driven apart,' MS. iii. 1. 4 (5. 2). Cf. also Ludwig, Der Rig-Veda iii, p. 500. We may now translate: 'I have driven out every sore which causes to crumble the bones of the spine (so according to Böhtlingk's lexicon: *kikasa* 2, 'Wirbelsäule'), also that which goes down to the *talidya*, also whatever one is fixed upon the head.'

No one has hitherto ventured to translate the word *talidya*: see Pet. Lex. and Bö. Lex. *sub voce*, and Ludwig, Der Rig-Veda iii. p. 500. If we consider that *kikasāḥ* represents the trunk (middle) of the afflicted body and *kakúdi* the head (top), it is *a priori* probable that *talidya* represents the bottom of the body. The parallelism between *talidyaṁ avatiṣṭhati* and *kakúdi çritāḥ* is that which prevails in very many familiar expressions and proverbs which aim to emphasize the fact that the *entire* human body is meant: 'from head to foot'; 'vom scheidel bis zu den zehen'; *ab imis unguibus usque ad verticem summum* (Cic. p. Rosc. Com. 7. 12); *talos a vertice ad imos* (Hor. Ep. ii. 2. 4); *ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἵλυτο διαμπερές ἐς πόδας ἄκρους* (Hom. Il. 16. 640); *ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν ἐς τὴν κεφαλὴν σοι πάντ' ἐρῶ* (Aristoph. Plutus 650), etc.

The Petersburg Lexicon cites the word *talahr̥daya*, 'die mitte der fusssohle,' from Hemacandra's Abhidhānacintāmaṇi. Böhtlingk, in his minor lexicon, stars the word to indicate that it cannot be quoted from the literature. The word, however, must occur in the medical çāstras, since it is quoted by Wise, Hindu System of Medicine, p. 70. It appears there as one of the *marmāṇi*, the vital parts of the body, and is described as being the part of the sole 'under and behind the fourth and fifth toe.' This refinement of the çāstra may be quietly set aside; but we

¹ Or perhaps better stem? Cf. the Greek formations in θ : $\nu\eta$ - $\theta\omega$, ϵ - $\nu\eta$ - $\theta\eta$, etc.

may consider it as certain that the sole of the foot, or some part of it, was called in classical Sanscrit *talahr̥daya*. With this Vedic *talīdyā* is perhaps identical, and, if so, it is likely that *talahr̥daya* is the product of the former by popular etymology. Hence too may come the specialization of the meaning which the *ṣāstra* attaches to the word (*tala* + *hr̥daya*). Whether *talīdyā* independently of its possible offspring, *talahr̥daya*, is to be connected with *tala*, 'sole of the foot' (*pāda-tala*), Lat. *talus*, need not be decided in this connection. And if, as is by no means impossible, *talīdyā* and *talahr̥daya* are of independent origin, I should nevertheless adhere to the translation of the former by 'sole of the foot.'

III.

On the so-called fire-ordeal hymn, Atharva-Veda ii. 12.¹

This hymn has been invested in the past with quite unusual interest, because it has been translated no less than five times, aside from many chance references to it, and because it has been considered very generally as an incantation accompanying a fire ordeal, pronounced by the person undergoing the ordeal against his accusers. It was, moreover, thus rendered prominent as containing the earliest intimation of the existence of ordeals in general, and furthermore the only distinct allusion to the ordeals in the Vedic *Saṃhitās*.

So far as the existence in the Vedic period of the fire ordeal, in a germinal form at least, is concerned, we have the distinct report of the *Pañcaviṅśa-brāhmaṇa* (xiv. 6. 6). Two Brahmans of the race of *Kaṇva*, *Vatsa* and *Medāhtithi* by name, are disputing, and in the course of the dispute *Medhātithi* accuses *Vatsa* of not being a Brahman, his mother having been a *Çūdra*-woman. *Vatsa* proposes an ordeal of fire to decide which one of them be the one more versed in brahmanical knowledge. *Vatsa* entered the fire singing the *Vātsa sāmān*, i. e. a *sāmān*-song of his own composition, and not a hair on his head was burned (*tasya na loma canāu "ṣat*). This, and a passage in the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* (6. 16) in which the guilt or innocence of a thief is determined by letting him carry in his hands a red-hot axe, are genuine Vedic (in the wider sense) instances of the existence of ordeals in general, and fire ordeals in particular. The later law books, furthermore, are quite explicit

¹ Presented to the A. O. S. at its meeting, October, 1887.

in their treatment of various other ordeals—they recognize nine altogether—such as licking a red-hot ploughshare, getting a metal coin from a kettle of hot melted butter, immersion into water, administering of poison, etc.

Standing upon such ground, the supposition that a Vedic hymn might be found which accompanied this religious and judicial act was very natural. It was accordingly made for this hymn, first by Emil Schlagintweit in an address before the Royal Bavarian Academy on the occasion of the 170th anniversary of its foundation, in March, 1866, entitled 'Die Gottesurtheile der Indier.' In 1873 Albrecht Weber translated the hymn a second time in his *Indische Studien*, xiii. p. 164 fg., supporting in all essentials Schlagintweit's view. Later, Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 184, and Ludwig, *Rig-Veda* iii. p. 445, also gave in their adhesion to this interpretation. Still more recently Kaegi in his excellent treatise entitled *Alter und Herkunft des germanischen Gottesurtheils* (*Festschrift zur Begrüssung der xxxix. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Zürich*; September, 1887), p. 51, has characterized the eighth verse of the same hymn as an utterance spoken over one about to pass through a fire-ordeal. Against this authority there has been but one dissenting voice. J. Grill, a disciple of Roth, has translated the hymn in his 'Hundert Lieder des Atharva-Veda,' p. 16 (cf. now also the second edition, pp. 47. 87), and cautiously places it, along with a number of other hymns, under the heading 'Feinde'; i. e. he supposes it to be directed against enemies. In his notes he expresses himself as not altogether convinced that the view of his predecessors is incorrect, but he cites an oral statement of Prof. Roth to the effect that he finds himself unable to detect anything pertaining to a fire-ordeal in the hymn.

I believe that the character of this hymn can be settled definitely by considering its treatment in the *Kāuṣika*, which a literal unprejudiced translation of the hymn itself will exhibit as perfectly intelligent; in all probability the ritual application and the diaskeuasis, which united the somewhat variegated materials of which the hymn consists, sprung up at the same time and as the result of the same ideas and needs. It is a fierce imprecation against an enemy who is thwarting some pious work with unholy practices. Accordingly it is treated in the sixth book of that treatise, which professes in its opening *sūtra* that it is devoted to *abhicāra*, witchcraft and incantation. In such practices our hymn

must have held a very prominent position, as it has a special and very significant name, which is the privilege of only a few favored and commonly employed hymns. It is called (Kāuṣ. 47. 12) *bharadvājapavraska* 'the hewer or cleaver of Bharadvāja' (who is the author; cf. ii. 12. 3). The passage in question is a paribhāṣā-sūtra introductory to the sixth book, and reads as follows: *bharadvājapavraskenā"ṅgirasam daṇḍam vṛṇcati*. Dārila glosses: *dyāvāpṛthivī urv antarikṣam iti sūktam bharadvāja(pra)vraskam bharadvājasampratyayārtham*. A literal translation of the sūtra is: 'With the cleaver of Bharadvāja (i. e. with the hymn AV. ii. 12) he cuts a staff for practices pertaining to witchcraft.' The real value of the passage is as follows: 'When in the course of rites described in the following book (the sixth, devoted to *abhi-cāra*) a staff for witchcraft¹ is needed, then this staff is to be cut with the hymn called the 'cleaver of Bharadvāja,' i. e. ii. 12. Cf. especially verse 2d: *vṛṇcāmi tām kulīṇene'va vṛkṣān yā asmākam mṛda idm hindsti* 'I cut him who interferes with this our plan, as one cuts a tree with an axe.' A staff so procured is then employed variously in Kāuṣ. 47. 14, 16, 18; 48. 22. In 47. 16 the function of this staff is sketched clearly as follows: *vajro'si sapatnahā tvayā'dya vṛtram sākṣīya . . . iti daṇḍam ādatte*, the person about to practice with such a staff takes it up while reciting the verse: 'Thou art a thunderbolt, a slayer of rivals, with thee may I to-day overcome an enemy, etc.' In 47. 18 the staff is employed actively in connection with the dire imprecation AV. vi. 134: *ayam vajra iti bāhyato daṇḍam ūrdhvam avāgagraṁ tiṣṭbhīr anvrcaṁ nihanti*, reciting the hymn AV. vi. 134 ('May this thunderbolt satiate itself in *ṛtam*; may it overthrow the empire and destroy the life of this one. May it break necks and crush skulls, as the Lord of might [Indra] crushed [the neck and skull] of Vṛtra, etc.) he stands outside holding the staff high in the air, the point downward, and strikes it into (the ground) three times, once after each verse of the hymn.'

¹ My authority for translating *āṅgirasa* rather freely by 'pertaining to witchcraft' is Kāuṣ. 47. 2 (also a paribhāṣā-sūtra of the sixth book): *dakṣiṇataḥ sam-bhāram āharaty āṅgirasam* 'utensils for the practice of witchcraft are brought on from a southerly direction.' Dārila's gloss is: *ghoradravyāṇām āharaṇam vidhānāt*. Cf. also the three names of one of the five so-called *kalpas* of the Atharva-Veda: *āṅgirasa-kalpa*, *abhi-cāra-kalpa*, or *vidhāna-kalpa* (J. A. O. S. xi. 378). In the ritual of the Atharvan the word *āṅgirasa* generally means 'pertaining to witchcraft.' Cf. also Rig-vidhāna iv. 6. 4.

Equally clear is the direct ritual application of the hymn. It is rubricated in Kāuṣ. 47. 25 fg.

25. *dyāvāprthivī urv iti paraṣupalāṣena dakṣiṇā dhāvataḥ padam vṛṣcati.*

Dār. *paraṣuḥ kuṭhāraḥ palāṣam kuṭhāramukhaṁ dakṣiṇāyām diṣi dhāvataḥ dveṣyasya padam pādasthānam chinatti.*

'One cuts the footprint of his enemy, as he runs in a southerly direction, with the blade of an axe, while reciting the hymn ii. 12.'

26. *anvak tris tiryak triḥ.*

Dār. *chedanavidhim āha: anupadarekhābhīḥ* (Cod. *anvupa*) . . . *triḥ prthutvāna tribhīḥ* (f).

'He cuts three (lines) along (the length of the footprint of the running enemy) and three (lines) across (the same).'

27. *akṣṇayā* (thus emended: two MSS *akṣṇayām*; five others *ayakṣṇayām*) *saṁsthāpya.*

Dār. *akṣṇaḥ koṇaḥ koṇe na samāpanam koṇa dvitvā* (! for *koṇe chiltvā* ?) *dvayo rekhayoḥ kriyā pratirekham* (Cod. *-reṣam*) *sūktāvṛttiḥ, saṁsthāpye 'ti vacanam prativraṣṣanagrahaṇam mā bhūt.*

Further on, sūtra 28 and 29 describe a method of testing the efficacy of this hostile practice:

28. *āvaskāt pāṁsūn¹ palāṣam* (var. *palāṣa*) *upanahya bhraṣṭre* (var. *bhraṣṭe*) *'bhyasyati* (var. *nyasyati*).

Dār. *vṛṣcitā adanyāñcūn* (! for *vṛṣcitād anyapāṁsūn* ?) *gr̥hitvā badhakaparṇe baddhvā* (Cod. *vadhvā*) *bhraṣṭe* (!) *lokaprasiddhe kṣipati.*

'He ties other dust obtained from the cut footprint into a leaf of the palāṣa-tree, and throws it into a frying-pan.'

29. *sphoṭatsu sṛtaḥ.²*

Dār. *śabda aṅguṣṭh mṛto dveṣya iti jñeyam.*

'If the dust crackles (in the pan) then (the enemy) has been overthrown.'

The sūtra then proceeds to prescribe still more elaborate and potent charms for the purpose of bringing the enemy down. But these do not cast any additional light upon the hymn.

In considering the hymn itself the first verse may be left aside for the present, as it is peculiarly the one upon which the explana-

¹ This reading, suggested in the note at Kāuṣ. 47. 28, is rendered certain by Keçava's explanation: *tasmāc chedāt pāṁsūn ca gr̥hitvā* . . .

² So two MSS; three *sṛtaḥ*; one *sṛtaḥ*; one *sṛutaḥ*; one *smṛtaḥ*.

tion as a fire-ordeal has sprung up. The translation of the remaining verses is as follows:

2. 'Hear this, O ye revered gods! Let Bharadvāja sing praises to you for me. May he who injures this our plan be bound in fetters and joined to misfortune.'

Schlagintweit translates the *pāda yó asmākam mṛṇa iddīm hindsti* by 'der diesen (unsern) geist beschädigt (d. i. schwur bezweifelt),' a translation and exposition absolutely arbitrary. Weber: 'Wer diesen meinen sinn beschädigt, d. i. meinen schwur antastet, mein wort bezweifelt.' Ludwig: 'der diesen meinen sinn anklagt (verläumdet).'

3. 'Hear, O soma-drinking Indra, what with eager heart I clamor for. I cleave, as one cleaves a tree with an axe, him who injures this our plan.'

4. 'With the aid of thrice eighty sāman-singers, with the aid of the Ādityas, Vasus, and Angirases—may the pious merit of the (departed) fathers aid us—do I seize this one with fateful grasp.'

Schlagintweit supplies 'firebrand' in the last *pāda*, and translates: 'nehme ich jenen (feuerbrand) an mich mit göttlicher inbrunst.' Weber, in still more direct adherence to the hypothesis of a fire-ordeal, supplies 'glühendes beil' with *amum*, and translates 'mit göttlicher gluth nehme ich diesen an mich.' Ludwig: 'jenen (den verläumder) erfasse ich mit der göttlichen glut.' Zimmer: 'halte ich jenen (? feuerbrand? axt) mit göttlichem griff.' Grill: 'mit göttlich mächtigem griff erfass ich diesen.'

5. 'Let heaven and earth look after me, may all gods assist me. O ye Angirases, O ye fathers delighting in soma, may he who does harm enter into misfortune.'

6. 'O ye Maruts, he who despises us, he who abuses the holy work that is being done (by us), may (our) zealous deeds be destructive for him, may the heavens burn the one hostile to holy acts.'

Then the poet takes the offensive; the metre changes. The passage is unmistakably employed in the sense claimed for the preceding verses by the diaskeuasts of the Atharvan, whatever the original purpose of its composition may have been.

7. 'I cut with my prayer your sevenfold breaths, your eightfold marrow; go to the seat of Yama, fitly prepared with Agni as guide.'

8. 'I set your footstep upon the kindled fire. May Agni surround your body, may your voice go to the spirits.'

Schlagintweit translates pādas 3 and 4, doing violence to the sense by supplying two conjunctions not in the text, '(entweder) soll das feuer in deinen leib einkehren, (oder) deine rede gehe zu leben.' The sense he imagines to be: 'If the word of the accuser is true, then he shall remain unharmed; if not, he shall be injured by fire.' Essentially in the same spirit are Weber's, Zimmer's, and Kaegi's renderings; while Ludwig, though he regards the hymn as a fire-ordeal, translates: 'Agni umhülle deinen leib, selbst die stimme geh.'

In Seven hymns of the Atharva-Veda, American Journal of Philology, Vol. vii. p. 476 (p. 11 of the reprint), I expressed the belief that the last two verses of this hymn are verses adapted for this imprecation from the funeral ritual. Grill had previously expressed the same view on p. 50 of the work cited above, and this view is supported by certain other instances quoted in my article, in which the secondary employment of verses belonging to the burial service may be assumed with some degree of certainty; cf. now No. 4 of this series.

The first verse is to be translated as follows: 'Heaven and earth and the broad mid-air, the goddess of the field and the wonderful far-stepping one (Viṣṇu),; the broad mid-air, guarded by the wind: may these be inflamed when I am inflamed (with fury).'

Schlagintweit: 'May these be burned here, if I am burned.' So also Weber, Ludwig, and Zimmer. Grill correctly: 'Die sollen glühen wenn mich Glut verzehret.' The appeal to heaven and earth and the misinterpreted fourth pāda are really the sole cause of the hypothesis of a fire-ordeal. The appeal to heaven and earth is in western minds strongly associated with asseverations of innocence. A similar construction of it for India is clearly unwarranted: at least this is certainly true so far as this hymn is concerned.

We must finally not ignore the negative evidence of the Kāuṣika so far as ordeals in general are concerned. Though the book is perhaps the most comprehensive encyclopaedia of the manners and customs of India which we possess, there appears in it, as far as I am aware, no instance of an ordeal. There is mention, however, of a *prāyaścitta*-ceremony, which is performed for a person over whom an accusation or evil reports are pending. The passage is Kāuṣ. 46. 1-3:

1. *utā'mṛtāsuḥ śivās ta ity abhyākhyātāya prayacchati. Dārila: pratiṣiddhakarmakartṛtvenā'bhiṣataḥ abhyākhyātāḥ tasmāi man-*

thāudanāu (? Cod. *manthanāu*) *prāyacchati prāyaścittam* 'while reciting AV. v. 1. 7 and vii. 43. 1 (etc.) one gives (a stirred drink and a porridge?) to the person accused (of the performance of forbidden deed), as an expiatory act.'

2. *drughaṇaṣiro rajjvā badhnāti* 'one ties an amulet consisting of the head of an axe with a string (to the accused person).'

3. *pratirūpam palāṣāyolohahiranyānām*. Dārila: *drughaṇaṣi-raḥsadr̥ṣaḥ pālāṣaḥ* (!) *prasiddhaḥ, ayaḥ kṛṣṇaloham, tāmraṁ hiranyaḥ suvarṇam elebhyaḥ drughaṇaṣira iva kṛtvā badhnāti, abhyākhyātaprāyaścittam* ' (that is) the image of an axe prepared out of palāṣa-wood, iron, copper or gold is tied to the accused, as an expiatory act.'

The entire performance seems to be undertaken for the purpose of reestablishing a soiled reputation. The amulet in the form of the head of an axe is perhaps intended to symbolize the act of cutting away or warding off the evil reports circulating about the person.

IV.

Women as Mourners in the Atharva-Veda.¹

In the Atharva-Veda xiv. 2. 59-62 we read as follows:

59. *yādī 'mē keṣīno jānā gṛhē te sam ānartīṣū rōdena kṛṇvanto 'ghām: agniṣ tvā tasmād ēnasah savitā ca prā muñcalām.*

60. *yādī 'yām duhitā tāva vikeṣy ārudad gṛhē rōdena kṛṇvaty āghām: agniṣ tvā, etc.*

61. *yāj jāmayo yād yuvatāyo gṛhē te sam ānartīṣū rōdena kṛṇvatir āghām: agniṣ tvā, etc.*

62. *yāt te prajāyām paṣūṣu yād vā gṛhēṣu niṣṭhitam aghakṛd-bhir āghām kṛlām: agniṣ tvā, etc.*

This group of mantras form part of the wedding stanzas of the AV. They have been translated by Weber, Ind. Stud. v. 214; Ludwig, Der Rig-Veda iii. 475; Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 288-9. Ludwig's translation of the first three of these stanzas is as follows:

'Wenn hier langbehaarte leute bei deinem hause einen tanz aufgeföhrt haben, mit weinen böse vorbedeutung beabsichtigend (böses anstellend), soll Agni dich von dieser befleckung und Savitar befreien.' 59.

'Wenn hier deine tochter (sogar) mit zerstreutem haar beim

¹ Presented to the A. O. S. at its meeting, October, 1890.

haus geheult, mit weinen böse vorbedeutung verursachend, soll Agni dich, etc.' 60.

'Wenn verwandte (schwestern sogar) junge frauen einen tanz bei deinem hause aufgeführt haben, mit weinen böse vorbedeutung verursachend, soll Agni dich, etc.' 61.

It is extremely difficult to imagine the situation depicted in Ludwig's version. He has not added any commentary, and in the absence of it one cannot see what particular part of the wedding rites are supposed by the translator to be implied in the recitation of these verses. Weber regards the stanzas as connected with expiatory performances in the house of the father, after the departure of the bride, and translates:

'Dass diese Haargeschmückten Leut' in deinem Haus zusamm' getanzt, Sünde thuend durch ihr Gejauchz,'— | Von diesem Uebel mög' Agni und Savitar freimachen dich.' 59.

'Dass diese deine Tochter dort im Hause weint' mit losem Haar, Sünde thuend durch ihr Gewein,'— | Von diesem Uebel, etc.' 60.

'Dass die Schwestern, dass die Jungfrau'n in deinem Haus zusamm' getanzt, Sünde thuend durch ihr Gejauchz,'— | Von diesem Uebel, etc.' 61.

The most notable feature in his version is the double translation of the word *ródena*: this is rendered by 'Gejauchz' in vss. 59 and 61, and by 'Gwein' in 60. Weber does not support his translation of the word *ródena* by 'gejauchz'—the word and the root *rud* in general mean 'howling, wailing'—by any other passages. He simply remarks that *ródena* in 59 (and 61) could refer to 'tears,' but that this does not fit in with the word 'dance' in the same stanza. Undoubtedly the difficulty of the passage as well as its solution are to be looked for at just this point—the reconciliation of the words *ródena* and *sam ánartīṣus*. Zimmer's translation agrees in all essentials with that of Weber: he also adopts the translation 'Gejauchz' in vss. 59 and 61, although his own doubts manifest themselves in a mark of interrogation after it. We may sum up Weber's and Zimmer's versions by stating that they regard 59 and 61 as *prāyaścitta*-stanzas for boisterous merriment at the wedding, while 60 is by them viewed as a stanza uttered in expiation of the wailing of the bride as she leaves the paternal house.

Not so the sūtra. At Kāuṣ. 79. 30 stanza 59 is rubricated along with the pratika of that most perplexing verse AV. xiv. 1.

46=RV. x. 40. 6, *jīvaṁ rudanti*. This latter is employed at Çāṅkh. Gr. i. 15. 2 and at Āçv. Gr. i. 8. 4. In both the stanza is recited by the bridegroom as he leaves with his newly married bride the house of her parents: *jīvaṁ rudanti 'ti prarudantyām* (Çāṅkh.); *jīvaṁ rudanti 'ti rudatyam* (Āçv.). 'If she cries, let him recite the verse which begins with the words *jīvaṁ rudanti*.' The passage Kāuç. 79. 30 reads *jīvaṁ rudanti yadī 'me keçina iti juhōti*. 'With the stanzas whose pratikas are *jīvaṁ rudanti* (xiv. 1. 46) and *yadī 'me keçinaḥ* (xiv. 2. 59) he pours an oblation of ghee (cf. Kāuç. 7. 3). Keçava's commentary plainly interprets the passage in accordance with the other sūtras: . . . *niyamānāyām pītrgrhe yadī rodanam bhavati tadā idaṁ prāyaścittam . . . jīvaṁ rudanti 'ty ekayā yadī 'me keçina iti catasṛbhir etābhir ājyaṁ juhōti . . . rudana (!) -prāyaścittam samāptam*. 'When the bride is led away, if wailing arises in the paternal house (of the bride), then this expiatory performance takes place. He pours an oblation of ghee, uttering the verse beginning with *jīvaṁ rudanti* (xiv. 1. 46), and the four verses beginning with *yadī 'me keçinaḥ* (xiv. 2. 59-62). Keçava's explicit statement that the four verses 59-62 are employed together in this *prāyaścittam* is well worth noting; he is quite right, for nowhere else in the sūtra is there any mention of any other use of the three verses following 59. The next stanza rubricated in the Kāuçika is 63. See Kāuçika-sūtra, index D, p. 410, column 1.

If we cling to the indications of the sūtra, it becomes clear that there is in these mantras no allusion to wedding festivities and merry-making of any sort, as is assumed by Weber and Zimmer. We may also safely assume that their sense in the eyes of the redactors of the Atharvan was just the same as that in which the Kāuçika employs them. But it does not follow that this was their primary value. The Atharvan often adapts for its immediate practical uses mantras which originally were constructed for a purpose altogether foreign to that in hand. We have dwelt upon this point especially in Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda, American Journal of Philology, vii, pp. 466 and 467 (pp. 1 and 11 of the reprint); the mantras in question represent a conspicuous instance of secondary adaptation to the purpose indicated by their ritual application.

Where shall we look for the situation originally depicted in these stanzas? Evidently we must seek an occasion at which wailing and dancing went together. This occasion is afforded by

certain funeral practices recorded in the AV. and one or two sūtras. The verses which allude to them seem to have been generally misunderstood. AV. 12. 5. 48 states this quite clearly:

*kṣiprāñ vai tāsya "dāhanam pari nr̥tyanti keçinīḥ :
āghnānāḥ pāṇinó 'rasi kurvāṇāḥ pāpām āilabām.*

This is a threat against the oppressor of Brahmans: 'Promptly do the women with their hair unloosened dance about his funeral pyre, beating their breasts with their hands and making an evil wailing.'¹ Every feature of the verse plays a part in the funeral ceremonies: 1. the funeral pyre; 2. the dance of women about the same; 3. the unloosened hair of the dancers; 4. the beating of the breasts of the women; 5. the wailing of the women. AV. xix. 32. 2 reads:

*nā 'sya keçān prā vapanti nō 'rasi tāḍam ā ghnate :
yāsmā achinnaparñēna darbhēṇa çarma yachati.*

Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 70, translates this verse quite erroneously as follows: 'wem dies gras schutz gewährt, dem raufen die leute die haare nicht aus, noch schlagen sie ihn auf die brust.' In fact the stanza contains the promise that he who uses *darbha*-grass shall not die and be buried: 'They do not cut his hair,² they do not beat their breasts for him whom (the priest) protects with *darbha*-grass whose leaves are uncut.' Here we have 6. an additional feature of the funeral ceremonies: the cutting of the hair of the corpse, in conjunction with 4. the beating of breasts. AV. viii. 1. 19 introduces features 3 and 5 again, palpably in allusion to funeral rites:

*ūt tvā mr̥tyór apīparam sām dhamantu vayodhāsaḥ :
mā tvā vyastakeçyō mā tvā 'gharūdo rudan.*

'I have passed you over death . . . , may the women with disheveled hair not wail over you, may the women who bewail misfortune (or who wail ominously) not wail over you.' Similarly AV. xi. 2. 11: *paró yantu agharūdo vikeçyāḥ*,³ 'may the females who wail ominously, they with disheveled hair, go away from

¹ Similarly the oppressor of Brahmans is threatened with a suggestion of his own funeral rites at AV. v. 19. 12 (cf. also xii. 5. 15). See P. A. O. S. for October 1889, Journal, Vol. xiv, p. clv, and below, p. 355.

² Cf. Āçv. Çr. vi. 10. 2: . . . *pretālatmkārān kurvanti keçaçmagrulomanakhāni vāpayanti.* Also Āçv. Gr. iv. 1. 16.

³ Grill, Hundert Lieder des AV.² p. 90, seems to put *agharūdo vikeçyāḥ* into agreement with *kroçṭārāḥ*, in spite of the difference in gender.

us,' *i. e.* 'may we not die.' Finally, AV. xi. 9. 14 presents features 3, 4 and 5, possibly also feature 2, if we admit the parallelism of *sam dhāv* with *sam nart* in xiv. 2. 59 sg. and *pari nart* in xii. 5. 48:

pratighnānāḥ sām dhāvāntū 'raḥ paśādurāv' āghnānāḥ:
aghāriṇīr vikeṣyō rudatyāḥ pūruṣe hatē radilē arbude tāva.

'Let those who beat against themselves run together striking their breasts and thighs, unanointed, with disheveled hair, wailing when a man has been slain, bitten by you, O Arbudi.' Stanza 7 of the same hymn contains the same statement paraphrased:

pratighnānā 'ṣrumukhī kṛdhukarṇī ca kroṣatu:
vikeṣī pūruṣe hatē radilē arbude tāva.

'Let her who beats herself, let the tear-faced, and the one with short ears (who has cut her ears?) shout; let her with disheveled hair shout when a man has been slain, bitten by you, O Arbudi.' Cf. also AV. xi. 10. 7:

dhūmākṣī sām palatu kṛdhukarṇī ca kroṣatu:
triṣandheḥ sēnayā jitē aruṇāḥ santu ketāvaḥ.

'May she with suffused eyes (lit. having smoke in her eyes) hurry on, may she with short ears hurry on, when (the enemy) has been conquered by Triṣaṁdhi's army . . .'

The passages assembled above do not all of them bear upon our custom with equal directness. In one or the other we may perhaps have before us not so much the mourning women with their wailings as the notion of other uncanny spectral beings, to which the transition was an easy one. The enemy and the unholy wizard, the uncanny and the demoniacal, are conceptions which constantly interlace in the Atharvan. Such secondary extension may underlie the immediate meaning of the last two passages (xi. 9. 7; xi. 10. 7) and of xi. 2. 11 above.

The sūtra-ritual has a trace of the same practice. At Āçv. Gr. iv. 6. 3 the mourners go about the ashes of the deceased guru three times from right to left, beating with their left hands upon their left thighs: *triḥ prasavyam pariyaṁti savyāḥ pāṇibhiḥ savyān ūrūn āghnānāḥ*. And at Kāuç. 84. 10, in the course of the preparation of the *ṣmaçāna*, it is stated explicitly that women

¹ Böhrling: 'ein bestimmter körperteil.' Our translation of the obscure word is based upon Kāuç. 84. 10: *triḥ prasavyaṁ prakīrṇakeçyaḥ pariyaṁti dakṣiṇān ūrūn āghnānāḥ*. The word seems to contain *ūru* with some modifying adjective, perhaps *prthu*, in a Prakṛtic form.

with disheveled hair are the performers: *trīḥ prasavyaṁ prakīr-
ṇakeṣyaḥ pariyanti dakṣinān ūrūn āghnānāḥ.*¹ Cf. with this last
especially AV. xi. 9. 14.

Returning now to verses xiv. 2. 59-61 of the wedding stanzas, it seems very likely that their original purpose was expiation (*prāyaścittam*) for the noisy practices at the funeral. The evil which the wailing women have brought on when they danced about with their hair unloosened, from this evil Agni and Savitar are called upon to free the family. The verses were adapted to the purpose for which they are employed by the Atharvavedins simply because they contained words for 'wailing.' This is precisely such a case as the secondary employment of the hymns AV. i. 2 and 3 as battle-charms: see *Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda*, p. 467 (2 of the reprint). In the Sūtras verses are frequently employed in connection with certain practices because they contain some single expression which suggests the practice. The untrammelled symbolism which runs riot in the Brāhmaṇas is at work in many ways also in the Sūtras, notably in the employment of the mantras, which are made to serve not only as what they really are, but in any significance which can for the moment be trumped up for them or for a part of them; often the relevance of the application of a mantra is to be sought in a single word occurring in the mantra—usually in its opening strain, its pratika—and this single word may be employed for the moment in a false sense or in a sense which it may have in some other connection, but does not bear in the mantra in question. See e. g. Ṣāṅkh. Gr. i. 15. 3, where the pratika *akṣann amimadanta* (RV. i. 82. 2) 'they have eaten, they have rejoiced,' is employed in connection with the application of axle-grease to the wagon (*rathākṣasyo 'pāñjanam*) simply because of the assonance of the words *akṣan*, 'they have eaten,' and *akṣa*, 'axle.'

I do not wish to exclude the possibility that a practice similar to the funeral dance may have been adopted among the Atharvavedins along with the verses on the occasion of the bride's departure. Cf. Ṣāṅkh. Gr. i. 11. 5. The words *gṛhē te* in stanza 59 lend a certain plausibility to such a view. At any rate the custom as well as the verses belongs fundamentally to the funeral rites of the Vedic Indians.

¹ Unloosened hair as a sign of mourning also at Āṣv. Gr. iv. 2. 9.

V.

On a Vedic group of charms for extinguishing fire by means of water-plants and a frog.¹

On various previous occasions I have endeavored to show that our understanding of the Atharva-Veda—the Veda of practical performance *par excellence*—depends upon a knowledge of the ritual which accompanied the recitation of the hymns. The boundary line between the Rig-Veda and the other Vedic *samhitās* is not absolute: large parts, if not all, of the Rig-Veda must have been accompanied by performances, and these must be instructive whenever recorded with any detail. That the Rig-Veda was not compiled for literary delectation is a view which I have held from the time of my earliest studies of that remarkable document. Professor Hillebrandt, in the preface to vol. i of his edition of Çaṅkhāyana's Grāuta-sūtra, p. xv, says: "It must be borne in mind that the Rig-Veda and the Atharva-Veda are for the most part prayer-books, and that these were but links in a long chain of more or less developed ceremonies. Herein, therefore, I agree fully with Professor Bloomfield, who, in his . . . studies on the Atharva-Veda, advocates the same view." I shall now endeavor to add one more instance in which a mantra passage, presented in somewhat varying forms by Rig-Veda, Atharva-Veda and Tāittirīya-Āraṇyaka, obtains its true definition by careful observation of the practices reported in connection with it: incidentally, a curious practice, reaching back to the earliest Vedic times, will be shown to have prevailed in almost all the Vedic schools.

The RV. passage of principal importance (x. 16. 13, 14) reads as follows:

yām tvām agne samādahas tām u nir vāpayā pūnah :
kiyambv ātra rohatu pākadūrvā vyālkaṣā.
ṣṭike ṣṭikāvati hlādike hlādikāvati :
maṇḍūkyā sū sām gama imām sv āgnīm harṣaya.

The corresponding passage of the AV. (xviii. 3. 6, 60) is as follows:

yām tvām agne samādahas tām u nir vāpayā pūnah :
kyāmbūr ātra rohatu ṣāṇḍadūrvā vyālkaṣā.
ṣām te nihārō bhavatu ṣām te prusvā 'va ṣiyatām :
ṣṭike ṣṭikāvati hlādike hlādikāvati :
maṇḍūky āpsū ṣām bhuva imām sv āgnīm ṣamaya.

¹ Presented to the A. O. S. at its meeting, October, 1890.

The Tait. Ār. vi. 4. 1. 2, 3 reads :

yāñ tvām agne samādahas tvām u nīr vāpayā pūnaḥ :
kyāmbūr ātra jāyatām pākādūrvā vyālkaṣā.
ṣṭitike ṣṭitikāvati hlāduke hlādukāvati :
maṇḍūkyāsu saṃgamāye 'māñ sv āgnīm ṣamāya.

Ludwig's translation of the Rig-Veda version, vol. ii, p. 564, is as follows: 'wo du, Agni, zusammengebrannt hast, dort sâe wieder aus, kiyāmbu wachse hier, essbare dūrvā, vyalkaṣā. Im külen, das voll külung, im erfrischenden, das voll erfrischung, kom mit dem froschweibchen zusammen, und erfreue diesen Agni.'

Grassmann's translation, vol. ii, p. 304, is as follows: 'Den du verbrannt, O Agni, hast, den fächle hold nun wieder an; dort geh die Wasserlilie auf, die Hirse und das Mannagrass.'

'Sei kühlungsreich, O kühles Kraut, erquickungsreich, erquickendes, verein dich mit dem Wasserkraut, erfreue diesen Agni schön.'

Each of the two translations approaches the true sense at some points, and recedes from it at others. But they are both, as they stand, unintelligible simply because they lack the background of realistic practice without which the verses never had nor could have had any sense. Hence Lanman, in the Notes to his Chrestomathy (p. 380^b), says of the second stanza, rather prematurely: 'The stanza seems to be meaningless rubbish.' The situation is simply as follows: After the fire has consumed the corpse, water is poured upon it in order to extinguish it. Then furthermore certain water-plants are put there. In addition to these a frog—here a female, elsewhere a male—is put upon the place where the fire has burned. These, as representatives of life in the waters, are symbolically supposed both to prevent and to extinguish fire; they are put there to clinch matters (*sv āgnīm ṣamāya*), lest perhaps the fire kindle anew and injure the person who is now to pass on to Yama's realm. RV. x. 16. 13 is to be thus translated: 'O Agni, do thou again extinguish him whom thou hast burned up; may the *kiyāmbū*, the small millet,¹ and the *vyalkaṣā* grow here.'

¹ Thus, rather than 'edible millet' (Ludwig: Sāyaṇa, *paripakvadūrvā*), because of *bṛhaddūrvā* mentioned in the extract from the two paddhatis of the Kāuṣika below. So also Sāyaṇa at Tait. Ār. vi. 4. 1. 2: *pākādūrvā alpāyā dūrvayā yuktā*. Note also his gloss on *kiyāmbū*: *kiyatā 'mbunā yuktā kacid oṣadhiḥ*. And Sāyaṇa at RV. x. 16. 13: *kiyatpramāṇam udakam yasmin*.

Ludwig in his translation has followed Sāyaṇa quite closely; the latter has altogether failed to understand the passage. At Tāit. Ār. vi. 4. 1. 2 he glosses *nir vāpayā* by *itaḥ sthānāt niḥ sāraya*; hence Ludwig's 'dort säe wieder aus.' But *nir vāpayā* here means simply 'extinguish.' See AV. vi. 18.1st: *agnīm hṛdayyām śokam tāṁ te nir vāpayāmasi*, 'the fire (of jealousy) which is in your heart, the chagrin, that do we extinguish for you.' At Ṣaṅkh. Ār. iv. 15. 13 the words are translated plainly: *yām tvam agna itī dvābhyām sakṣireṇa 'dakenā 'sthini nirvāpya*, 'while reciting the two stanzas, RV. x. 16. 13, 14, the bones (of the corpse) are extinguished with water mixed with milk.' At Āçv. Gr. iv. 5. 4, where, to be sure, only the second of the two Rig-verses (14) is rubricated, milk and water are also sprinkled upon the bones: *kṣīrodakena śamiṣākhayā triḥ prasavyām parivrajan prokṣati śitike śitikāvati 'ti*. And Tāit. Ār. vi. 4. 1. 1 expresses the act in mantra-form: *yām te agnīm āmanthāma vṛṣabhāye 'va pāktave, imām tāṁ śamayamasi kṣīreṇa co 'dakena ca*. 'The fire which we have churned for you, as if for the purpose of roasting a bull, that fire do we quench with milk and with water.'

Thus the meaning of the first verse is clear. The second verse of the RV. version is to be translated: 'O cool [plant], full of coolness, O moist plant, full of moisture, do thou come right along with the female frog,' gladden much (euphemistic for 'extinguish,' *śamaya*, of the other versions) this fire here.'

In the first place, it is quite certain that the vocatives *śitike*, etc., are addressed to a plant.² The performance which is connected with the two corresponding verses of the AV. at Kāuç. 82. 26, 27 is as follows: *upa dyām śam te nīhāra itī mantroktāny avadāya kṣīrotsiktēna brāhmaṇasyā 'vasiñcati madhūtsiktēna kṣatriyasyo 'dakena vaiçyasya*. Two paddhatis, the Antyeṣṭikarma and the Ātharvaṇīya-paddhati explain as follows: *upa dyām itī dvābhyām . . . śam te nīhāra itī ekayā mantroktānām oṣadhīnām udakam kṣīraṁ cāi 'katra kṛtvā brāhmaṇasyā 'sthini siñcati, madhūtsiktēna kṣatriyasyo 'dakena vaiçyasya*. We may paraphrase sūtra and

¹ Thus correctly Sāyaṇa at RV. x. 16. 14: *maṇḍūkyā maṇḍūkastriyā vṛṣṭipriyayā*.

² Sāyaṇa at Tāit. Ār. vi. 4. 1. 3 notwithstanding: *śitena jalena yuktā bhūmīḥ śitikā, hlādakāriṇā kṣīreṇa yuktā bhūmīḥ hlādukā . . . śitikāvati śitikābhūmiyukte sthāne . . .* Interesting is Stenzler's translation of the pratīka at Āçv. Gr. iv. 5. 4: 'O bleiche erd' mit bleichem laub.' Even in the later classical period the stems *śitala* and *hlādin* are standing epithets and designations of various cooling plants. See Pet. Lex. sub vocs.

comment as follows: 'With the verses AV. xviii. 3. 5, 6, 60 (the last two concern us here) the plants mentioned in the mantras are cut off and put into a mixture of milk and water in order to sprinkle the bones of a Brahman, into a mixture of honey and water to sprinkle the bones of a Kṣatriya, into simple water to sprinkle the bones of a Vāiçya.'

The paddhatis then go on to give a catalogue of the plants (and other materials), the most characteristic of which are the reed-plant *vetasa*, the *bṛhaddūrvā* (see the mantras), the *avakā* (see below), and the *maṇḍūkapaṇṇī*, evidently also a water-plant. Neither Kāuṇika nor his commentary here mention the frog; it is possible that the word *maṇḍūki* was understood by them merely as an additional water-plant: see Pet. Lex. sub voce and *maṇḍūkapaṇṇī* of the paddhatis.¹ But at Vāit. Sū. 29. 13 the frog and the water-plants appear in company: *idaṁ va āpo himasya tvo 'pa dyām ūpa vetasam apām idam iti maṇḍūkāvakāvetasāir dakṣiṇādik pratidiṣaṁ vikṛṣyamāṇāṁ*. 'While reciting AV. iii. 13. 7; vi. 106. 3; xviii. 3. 5 (6); vi. 106. 2 he scatters the fire (on the altar) by means of a frog, *avakā* and *vetasa*-reed into every direction, beginning at the south.' Further and plentiful evidence in favor of our translation of the word and our conception of the rite is not wanting.

The Vājasaneyins, Tāittiriyakas and Maitrāyaṇīyas practiced with a somewhat different yet closely related charm when extinguishing sacred fires. The mantras which bear upon the practice occur in VS. xvii; TS. iv. 6. 1; MS. ii. 10. 1: the chapter is designated in the TS. as *agnisamskṛtiḥ, pariṣecanavikarṣanādayaḥ* (sc. *mantrāḥ*):

samudrāsya tvā 'vakayā 'gne pāri vyayāmasi:

pāvako asmābhyaṁ śivo bhava.

himāsya tvā jarāyuna 'gne pāri vyayāmasi:

pāvako asmābhyaṁ śivo bhava.

ūpa jmaṇṇ ūpa vetasē 'va tara² nadīṣu ā:

agne pittām apām asi maṇḍūki tābhir ā gahi:

sē 'mām yajñāṁ pāvakāvarṇaṁ śivām kṛdhi.

apām idām nydyanam samudrāsya nivēṣaṇam:

anyāṁs³ te asmāt tapantu hetāyaḥ pāvako asmābhyaṁ śivo bhava.

¹ The Tāit. Ār. which reads *maṇḍūkyāsu*, is thus glossed by Sāyaṇa: *maṇḍūkyāsu maṇḍūkaplavanayogyāsu apsu satīgamaya prāpaya*.

² TS. 'vattaraṁ.

³ TS. *anyāṁ*.

'With the *avakā*-plant of the sea do we, O Agni, envelop thee; be thou to us a purifier, be thou kind to us.

'With a covering of coolness do we, O Agni, etc.

'Do thou descend to the earth into the reed-plant on the rivers; thou art, O Agni, the sap of the waters.' O female frog, do thou come with these (waters); do thou here render this sacrifice pure in aspect and propitious.

'Here is the gathering place of the waters, here is the dwelling place of the sea; may your missiles (O Agni) burn other persons than us; be thou to us a purifier, be thou kind to us.'²

The central figures in this charm, as in that of the RV. and AV., are Agni, the water-plant *avakā*, and the female frog. That the last two are symbols of the water which is to quench the fire Mahīdhara recognizes clearly. At VS. xvii. 4; *samudrasya (samundati klinnaṁ karoti samudro) jalam tasyā 'vakayā (śevālena) tvā (tvām) pari vyayāmasi (parito veṣṭayāmaḥ)*. And at xvii. 4. 6: *evam agniṁ sambodhya maṇḍūkīm āha: he maṇḍūki (maṇḍūko bhekas tasya strī maṇḍūkī) tatsambuddhāu he maṇḍūki tābhiḥ pūrvoktābhir adbhīḥ saha ā gahi (āgacha)*. The TS., in its brāhmaṇa-chapter, v. 4. 4, works up this charm, and while its explanation of the symbolism involved is as far from the mark as is usual with these productions, it yet states clearly that the fire was actually put out with the aid of the *avakā*-plant and the frog: *apām vā etāt pūṣpam yād vetasā, 'pām śarō 'vakā, vetasaṣākhāyā cā 'vakābhiḥ ca vi karṣaty, āpo vāi śāntāḥ, śāntābhir evā 'sya śūcaṁ śamayati, yō vā agniṁ citāṁ prathamāḥ paśūr adhikrāmati "śvarō vāi tām śucā pradāho. maṇḍūkeṇa vi karṣaty, eṣā vai paśūnām anupajīvanīyō nā vā eṣā grāmyeṣu paśūṣu hitō nā "raṇyeṣu, tām evā śucā 'rpayati*. 'The reed-plant is the flower of the waters, the *avakā* the reed of the waters: with the reed-plant and with *avakā*-plants does he scatter the fire. Holy (*śāntāḥ*) are the waters: with holy ones (*śāntābhir*) then does he quiet (*śamayati*) its heat. Whatever animal is the first to step over the heaped fire, that he is able to burn with his heat. He scatters the fire with the frog; for this one does not furnish sustenance to animals, he does not count among the tame nor among the wild animals: upon him (the frog) does he cause the heat to go.'

Blowing aside the chaff of Talmudic wisdom, we are left with the

¹ Literally 'gall of the waters.' Mahīdhara, *apām tejo 'si*.

² Heiliger Sanct Florian

Schütz' unser haus zünd' andre an.'

incidental and therefore trustworthy statement that the fire was put out with the aid of the *avakā* and the frog. Very similar and more explicit is the statement in *Çat. Br. ix. 1. 2. 20*: *dthāi "nañ vikarṣati, mañḍūkenā 'vakayā vetasaçākḥdyā*, 'thereupon he scatters the fire by means of a frog, an *avakā*, and the branch of a reed.' The motive assigned is in a vein similar to the extract from the *brāhmaṇa*-passage of the TS. And at *Kāty. Çr. xviii. 2. 10* the same proceeding is formulated in *sūtra*-form: *mañḍūkāvā-kāvetasaçākḥā veñāu baddhvā 'vakarṣati*, glossed: *mañḍūkādīn veñāu baddhvā 'gnīm vikarṣati*. 'Having tied a frog, an *avakā*, and the branch of a reed to a bamboo-cane, he scatters the fire.' And almost identically *Āp. Çr. xvii. 12*:—*avakāvetasaçākḥām mañḍūkām ca dīrghavañçe prabadhya samudrasya tvā 'vakaye 'ti saptabhir aṣṭabhir vā 'gnīm vikarṣati*.

The Atharvan and the Rig have each preserved one more charm against fire: they are closely related in character to those cited above. AV. vi. 106 reads as follows:

1. *āyane te parāyaṇe dūrvā rohatu puṣpīṇi :
ūtso vā tātra jāyatām hradō vā puṇḍārikavān.*
2. *apām idām nyāyanām samudrāsya nivēcanaṁ :
mādhye hradāsya no grhāḥ parācīnā mūkhā kṛdhi.*
3. *himāsya tvā jarāyuṇā çāle pāri vyayāmasi :
çilāhradā hi no bhūvo 'gnis kṛnotu bheṣajām.*

RV. x. 142. 7, 8 reads as follows:

*apām idām nyāyanām samudrāsya nivēcanaṁ :
anyām kṛnuṣve 'tāḥ pānthām tēna yāhi vāçāñ anu.
āyane te parāyaṇe dūrvā rohantu puṣpīṇi :
hradāç ca puṇḍārikāṇi samudrāsya grhā imé.¹*

The Atharvan version may be rendered thus:

'On your way hither and on your way off from here may the blooming *dūrvā* grow; may a well-spring here spring forth, or a lotus-laden pond.

'Here is the gathering place of the waters, here is the dwelling-place of the sea. In the midst of the pond may our house be, turn (O fire) away your face.

'With a covering of coolness do we envelop thee, O house,²

¹ Cf. with both passages Mahābh. i. 8520 fg.

² This half-verse is especially characteristic for the secondary manipulation of mantra-material on the part of the Atharvavediṇs: there can be no doubt that the version of this line presented by the Yajus-saṁhitās, above, is the older and original form of the mantra. They have *dgne* for *çāle*: the former furnishes the proper contrast with *himāsya*.

cool as a pond be thou for us. Agni shall furnish remedy (*i. e.* not destruction).'

The Rig-Veda version may be translated as follows:

'Here is the gathering place of the waters, here is the dwelling-place of the sea. Find (O fire) a path away from here, travel that as you please.

'On your way hither and on your way off from here may the flowery *dūrvā* grow. Let there be pools and lotus-flowers; these here are the chambers of the sea.'

There is, to my knowledge, no report as to the special employment in practice of the RV. stanzas; they occur at the end of an Agni hymn, and it may be taken for granted that at some stage in the use of the hymn over a fire the quenching of the fire formed a part of the practice: for this the last stanzas of the hymn were called in. The Atharvan version, as may be seen from the bent given their form and contents by the Atharvan-ṛṣis themselves, was intended as a charm to protect house and home from fire. As such it is employed at Kāuṣ. 52. 5 fg.,¹ and it is of great interest to find the *avakā*-plant holding a prominent place in the performance:

52. 5. *āyana iti ṣamanam antarā hradāṁ karoti*. Keçava's gloss: *agnidāvarakṣārtham ucyate . . . udakam abhimantrya garle prakṣipati . . . udakapūraṇaṁ karoti*, 'with the hymn AV. vi. 106 he performs the act of extinguishing fire within a pond.'

52. 6. *ṣāle(?)ca*. Keç. *ṣālāmadhye . . . udakam abhimantrya garle prakṣipati*, 'and he performs the rite in the house also.'

52. 7. *avakayā ṣālāṁ paritanoti*. Keç. . . . *agniyūpasarga etat karma*, 'he envelops the house with the *avakā*-plant.'

The frog does not appear in this quench-charm, but both the frog and the *avakā* appear once more in a closely kindred rite at Kāuṣ. 40. 1 fg. This is a charm for conducting a river into a new channel, performed in connection with AV. iii. 13; the point is the same: to produce water where formerly there was none.

40. 1. *yad adaḥ samprayatir iti yene 'chen nadi pratipadyete 'ti prasiṁcan vrajati*, 'while reciting the hymn AV. iii. 13 he walks sprinkling the path which he wishes a river to travel.'

40. 2. *kāṣadividhuvakavelasān niminoti*, 'he sticks up the grasses and reeds called *kāṣa*, *dividhuvaka*² and *vetasa* (on this path).'

¹ Two verses of the hymn are rubricated in the passage from the Vāit. Sū. quoted above.

² Dār. *kāṣaḥ prasiddhaḥ*. Keç. *diviḡvālāparṇīm* (Cod. -*sevāla*-), evidently a water-plant: the *ṣevāla* and the *avakā* are synonymous; see below.

40. 3. *idaṁ va āpa iti hiraṇyam adhidadhāti*. Dārila: *nadī-mukhopari sthāpayati*, 'while reciting the first pāda of the seventh stanza of the hymn he places gold upon the mouth of the river (i. e. the point from which the river shall branch into the desired channel?).'

40. 4. *ayaṁ vatsa iti 'śikāñjimaṇḍukāṁ nilalohitābhyāṁ sūtrābhyāṁ sakakṣaṁ' baddhvā*, 'with the second pāda of the seventh stanza he ties a frog who is striped like the reed *śikā* at his forefeet with two threads, one blue and the other red.'

40. 5. *ihe 'ttham ity avakayā prachādayati*, 'with the third pāda of the seventh stanza he envelops (the frog) with an *avakā*-plant.'

The symbolism of these acts is unmistakable: they anticipate the presence of the river with all its life. The gold anticipates the golden-colored waters—*hiraṇyavarṇāḥ śucayaḥ pāvakāḥ . . . āpāḥ*, AV. i. 33. 1; the river grass and the reeds symbolize the vegetation. And above all, the frog, securely tied so that he cannot leap away,² and the water-bringing *avakā* reach back to that early conception which, as we have proved, exists in the hymns themselves.

The *avakā* (*Blyxa octandra*) is the plant which is known in later literature by a group of slightly differentiated names. At Āṣv. Gr. ii. 8. 14; iv. 4. 8, it is glossed in the text itself by *śipāla* (*avakāṁ śipālam iti*), a form which occurs also in the RV. Elsewhere the forms *śevāla* (*śebāla*), *śevala*, *śāivāla* (*śāibāla*), *śāivāla*; see Pet. Lex. sub vocs. The plant scarcely ever appears without the mention or suggestion of water in its train. At RV. x. 68. 5 light drives darkness from the atmospheric circle just as the wind blows the *śipāla* out of the water: *dpa jyōtiṣā tamo antāriḥṣād udndh śipālam iva vāta ājat*. At AV. viii. 7. 9 are mentioned plants whose womb is the *avakā* (i. e. which are of the *avakā*-class), whose very essence is water: *avdkolvā* (*bahuvrīhi*) *udakātmāna oṣadhayaḥ*. At AV. iv. 37. 8 the Gandharvas who are particularly associated with the waters (*apām gandharvāḥ*, RV. ix. 86. 39; *gandharvā apsū*, RV. x. 10. 4; AV. xviii. 1. 4), who dwell on the banks of the rivers like the Apsaras (Pischel, Vedische

¹ Dār. here: *saha kakṣābhyāṁ baddhvā, kakṣā prasiddhā*. At Kāuṣ. 32. 17, *gakuṇin iva karoti*. At. 48. 40. *saha bāhubhyāṁ baddhvā*.

² Cf. also AV. iv. 15. 12: *dva nītir apāḥ sṛja vādantū pṛṇibāhavo maṇḍūkā triṇā'nu*. Pour downward (O Asura pitar, Jupiter, Zeus) the waters; may the speckle-footed frogs croak in the ditches.' Cf. also RV. vii. 103.

Studien i. p. 79), are called *avakā*-eaters (*avakādā*). So also at iv. 37. 10 the Will o' the wisp, or Jack o' the lanthorn is called *avakādā*; see Roth, Festgruss an Böhtlingk, p. 97 fg. At VS. xvii. 4; TS. iv. 6. 1. 1; MS. ii. 10. 1, the plant is spoken of as 'the *avakā* of the sea': *samudrāsya tvā 'vakayā*. At Çat. Br. vii. 5. 1. 11; viii. 3. 2. 5, the *avakā* is identified outright with water: *ūpo vā āvakāḥ*. At Āçv. Gr. ii. 8. 14, when building a house an *avakā* is placed into the cavities of the timbers, 'for it is known that no conflagration will befall him': *garteṣu avakām śipālam ity avadhāpayen na hā 'sya dāhuko bhavati 'ti vijñāyate*. And ibid. iv. 4. 8 an *avakā* is placed in a cavity, from which the cremated corpse is supposed to ascend heavenward. The *avakā* is supposed to quench the burning body: *uttarapurastād āhavanī-yasya jānumātram gartaṁ khātvā 'vakām śipālam ity avadhāpayet tato ha vā eṣa niṣkramya sahāi 'va dhūmena svargaṁ lokam eti 'ti ha vijñāyate*. Cf. with this last extract Çāṅkh. Çr. iv. 15. 13, above.

We return from this long excursion to the Rig-stanzas which form the text of the investigation. It is evident that the scenic properties which form the corporeal part, as it were, of the verses have been found. There is but one step left to take—it is not a bold one—i. e. to identify the plant addressed in x. 16. 14 as *śitike hlādike* with the *avakā*. The verse then joins the group of Yajus-verses quoted above: its ritual, though not reported in detail, as far as we know, by the brāhmaṇas and sūtras of the Rig-Veda, is doubtless the same as that of the Yajus and Atharvan schools.

VI.

On the Vedic instrumental *paḍbhīs* and the word *pāḍbiṣa*.¹

The instrumental plural *paḍbhīs* occurs six times in the RV. It is wanting in the AV., and we do not know how often it occurs in the remaining *mantra*-literature. The writer knows of it at VS. xxiii. 13, and Kāuṣ. 44. 17. It is mentioned in the fourth chapter of the *nāighaṇṭavas* (4. 2), erroneously ascribed to Yāska;² the

¹ Presented to the A. O. S. at its meeting, October, 1889.

² The 48th *pariṣiṣṭa* of the Atharva-Veda contains a collection of glosses similar to that upon which Yāska has commented. The author is said to be Kāutsavaya. The glosses are divided into 69 paragraphs; they exhibit some words characteristic of the Atharvan, e. g. *nilāgalasālā* and *kunakhin* in §66,

chapter contains a collection of words which were regarded very early as cruces. Yāska, Nirukta i. 20, speaks of them as words which admit of various interpretations; and accordingly he offers at Nir. v. 3 no less than three explanations of the word in connection with RV. x. 99. 12: *pānāir iti vā spāṇānāir iti vā sparṇānāir iti vā*, all of which are obviously useless. On the other hand, Sāyaṇa in his commentary to the RV. and Mahidhara at VS. xxiii. 13 gloss the word with *pādāis*, or something very like; and the latter explains it by *padbhis*, the ordinary instr. plur. of *pād*, the *ḍ* being, according to him, a peculiarity of the *mantra*-language: *padaṣabdasya ḍāntatvam chāndasaṁ*.

The western interpretation of the word, begun by Roth (Nirukta v. 3, Erläuterungen, p. 54), for a long time was content to believe that Sāyaṇa's and Mahidhara's explanation was in general correct: only for RV. iv. 2. 12 Roth posits a stem *paṣ* 'glance,' which interpretation is repeated with more or less confidence by later authorities. Ludwig denies in his translation of the RV., iv. 309, the derivation of *padbhis* from *pād* 'foot' or *pāṣ* 'glance'; he assumes instead a stem *paṣ* 'rope' = *pāṣa*; later, v. 626, he still denies the equation *padbhis* = *padbhis*, but admits the stem *paṣ* = *spāṣ*. Quite recently, Bartholomae has reviewed the question in Bezz. Beitr. xv. 3 fg., concluding that *padbhis* cannot by any known phonetic process be derived from *pād* 'foot,' that the current translation 'with the feet' is untenable, and that the word is to be referred in part to *paṣ* 'glance,' and in part to *paṣ* 'rope, snare' (ibid. p. 8). Pischel, Vedische Studien (Pischel and Geldner), i. 105, also assumes a meaning akin to 'rope' (zügel), translating *padbhīr gṛdhyantam* (RV. iv. 38. 5) by '(das ross) ungeduldig in den zügeln'; cf. the very different result obtained by Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. xv. 7. Still more recently, Pischel, in Vedische Studien i. 228 fg., has devoted a learned and ingenious study to the same question: some of his results the writer accepts unhesitatingly; others seem to him untenable.

Ludwig's and Bartholomae's suggestion that *padbhis* never means 'with the feet' in the Rig-Veda is improbable on a priori

but repeat in general the material of the other collection, distributed differently. The text is contained in two MSS of the *pariṣiṣṭas*, belonging to the Bombay government; copies of it are in my possession, but an edition of the glosses is impossible, owing to the excessive corruption of the MSS. In the Berlin MSS of the *pariṣiṣṭas* the *nirukta* does not appear; apparently the leaves containing it have been cut out. The word *padbhis* I have not been able to find in this text. See now P. A. O. S. for October 1890, No. 4.

grounds. It would be a curious freak of chance that the instrumental plural of *pād*, which is found four times in the AV., should be wanting entirely in the RV., while, on the other hand, the instrum. plural of *paç* 'glance' and *paç* 'rope' should be equally wanting in the AV. Bartholomae's efforts to dispose of every case of *paḍbhis* fail in the case of the passage VS. xxiii. 13, *eṣḍ syā rāthyo vṛṣā paḍbhiḥ catūrbhir e'd agan*. This he fairly gives up (p. 8). Yet it can have but one sense: 'This steed, fit for the chariot, has come here indeed with four feet.' AV. iii. 7. 3 offers a close parallel, reading *paḍbhis* without cerebral *ḍ*: *ānu tvā harino vṛṣā paḍbhiḥ catūrbhir akramit* 'the strong antelope has come after you with four feet.' Cf. also AV. iv. 14. 9. At Kāuṣ. 44. 17, while the *vaçā* is slain the following mantra is recited: *yad vaçā māyūm akrata uro vā paḍbhir āhata agnir mā tasmād enasaḥ viçvān muñcatv añhasaḥ* 'if the *vaçā* have bleated, or have struck the breast with their feet, may Agni free me from this sin and release me from every evil.' The MSS are divided pretty equally between *paḍbhir* and *paḍbhir*: the editor has adopted the lectio doctior *paḍbhir*. The parallel versions—TS. iii. 1. 4. 3; KQS. xxv. 9. 12; QQS. iv. 17. 10 (or 12); GGS. iii. 10. 28: Mantra-Br. ii. 2. 8—read *paḍbhir*, without cerebralization.

This proves sufficiently that *paḍbhis* in certain cases is related to *pād* 'foot.' Pischel also admits this value for *paḍbhis* in RV. v. 64. 7; x. 99. 12, and VS. xxiii. 13; but he believes that the *ḍ* is borrowed from *paḍbhis*, instr. plur. of *paç* 'eye' and *paç* 'rope,' which were falsely understood by the diaskeuasts as equal to *paḍbhis* 'with feet.' Bartholomae, loc. cit., had previously made the same suggestion as a dernier ressort to explain VS. xxiii. 13, he having previously explained all the six instances of *paḍbhis* in the RV. as derived from *paç* 'rope' and *paç* 'eye.' Bartholomae gives up, as already noted, the explanation of the passage from VS. The expression *paḍbhiḥ catūrbhiḥ* seems to him quite inexplicable, and it is indeed at first sight useless. As it occurs several times—see the passages from the AV. presented above—it is likely to have some sense, and I believe that it may help in the exegesis of some of the passages in the RV. The phrase *paḍbhiḥ catūrbhiḥ* expresses the simple notion that the speed of animals is due to their character as quadrupeds. Animals run swiftly with their four feet, and because of their four feet. If the notion is generalized, *paḍbhis*, when used of human beings, may have been felt in contrast to *paḍbhyām* to mean 'with (four) feet,' and thus

'quickly, nimbly, briskly,' etc. RV. v. 64. 7 *c d*, ā *paḍbhīr dhāvataṁ narā bībhṛatāu arcanānasam* 'run hither nimbly, O ye two heroes, to preserve Arcanānas.' RV. x. 99. 12, *evā mahā asura vakṣāthāya vamrakāḥ paḍbhīr ūpa sarpaḍ indram* 'thus, O Asura, did great Vamraka quickly come to Indra for prosperity.' It seems difficult to imagine another meaning of *paḍbhīr* in these two passages, especially the last. Pischel has left it untranslated, though admitting that *paḍbhīr* comes from *pād* 'foot'; it seems simply inane to translate 'Vamraka went to Indra with his feet (plural!).'

We venture the same exegesis for *paḍbhīr* in RV. x. 79. 2: *ātrāṇy asmāi paḍbhīḥ sām bharanty, uttāndhastā nāmasā 'dhi vikṣū* 'nimbly do they carry together fuel for him,' etc. Bartholomae and Pischel follow Ludwig in regarding *paḍbhīḥ* as a ritual expression, equivalent to *idhmasaṁnahana*, and translate 'they bring together his fuel with ropes,' etc. But the hymn is mystical, and it seems unlikely that a dry technical detail of the ritual should appear singly in such connection. We may rather compare the adverb *ṛṣū* 'nimbly' in verse 5: *yó asmā ānnaṁ ṛṣv ādadhāti*, etc. 'he who nimbly (or eagerly) puts on fuel for him,' etc. Cf. also x. 115. 6: *vājintamāya sāhyase . . . ṛṣū cydvāno dnu jādvedase . . .* Agni is voracious (RV. i. 58. 2, 4; vii. 3. 4; x. 91. 7; 113. 8) and needs to be supplied expeditiously.

The remaining three passages which exhibit the word *paḍbhīḥ* are RV. iv. 2. 12, 14; 38. 3. Pischel shows conclusively that *paḍbhīḥ* in the first two passages means 'with the eyes,' and we may regard this as the most certain of all the results which have accrued from the repeated discussion of the word in recent times. Add to the citations on p. 230 a passage from Kāuṣ. 42. 17: *yad vratam atipede citlyā manasā hr̥dā*. On the other hand, there is nothing convincing in either Bartholomae's or Pischel's renderings of RV. iv. 38. 3: *paḍbhīr gr̥dhyantam medhayūṁ nā ṣūram*; see Bezz. Beitr. xv. 7; Vedische Stud. i. 105, 232. I see no objection to the translation '(the horse) impatient with his feet, as a hero (is impatient) when eager for strife' (*medhayū* = *saṁgrāmechu*, Sāyaṇa).

We may note the juxtaposition of *paḍbhīḥ* with the stem *hastā*, or a derivative of it, in three of the six passages from the RV.: iv. 2. 14 (*paḍbhīr hastebhīḥ*); v. 64. 7 (*hastibhir . . . paḍbhīḥ*); x. 79. 2 (*paḍbhīḥ . . . uttāndhastāḥ*). It would seem from this that the word under discussion must have suggested strongly either by sound or meaning the ordinary *paḍbhīḥ*.

The words *pādḍiṣa* (RV.), *paḍviṣa* (VS.), *paḍviṇṣa* (LṚS. and Mantra-Br.), and *pādgr̥bhi* have been regarded generally as compounds, containing in their first member the stem *paḍ* = *pad* 'foot.' Pischel has undertaken in the same paper (p. 333 fg.) to prove that the first part of the word is the stem *paṣ* = *pāṣa* 'rope,' so that *pādḍiṣa* is in effect about the same as *pāṣa*. It seems to me that all he succeeds in showing is that the strictly etymological value of the word according to the old explanation is not always kept up. So e. g. in the passage from the Mantra-Br. i. 2. 10, *annam prāṇasya paḍviṇṣaḥ*, the last word has certainly the general value 'fetter.' But such passages are no more calculated to disprove the original meaning 'foot-fetter' than *ἵππο-βουκόλος* 'horse-herd' disproves the etymology of *βου-κόλος*. Pischel attaches importance to the passage MBh. iii. 297. 16, where it is said that Yama draws the souls of men from their bodies, and binds them with fetters; he concludes from this that the Vedic view was the same, and that we must shut out the notion that Yama fetters the foot of the dead. But AV. viii. 8. 16 reads: *imā upātā mṛtyupāṣā yān ākramya nā mucyase* 'here are thrown the snares of death, stepping into which thou shalt not be released.' Obviously the snare of death is here supposed to be directed against the foot stepping into (*ākramya*) it. At Kāuṣ. 16. 15, 16 these *pāṣāḥ*, along with *aṣvatthāni kūṭāni* (traps made of *aṣvattha*-wood) and *bhāṅgāni jālāni* (nets of hemp) are placed in the way of an advancing enemy. Cf. also Kāuṣ. 14. 28: *bhāṅgamāuñ-japāṣān . . . senākrameṣu vapati*. Another and the more specific designation of this *mṛtyupāṣā* is *mṛtyōḥ pādḍiṣa* and *yamasya pādḍiṣa*; but the parallelism must not be employed to prove that *pādḍiṣa* has just the same value as *pāṣa*. That *pāṣa* and *pādḍiṣa* are not identical seems to be shown conclusively at AV. xvi. 8. 27, where *pādḍiṣa* occurs side by side with *pāṣa*: *sā mṛtyōḥ pādḍiṣāt pāṣān mā moci*. The word *pādḍiṣa* occurs only in connection with *mṛtyu* in this hymn; of all the other twenty-six divinities and personifications in the same litany (vv. 1-26) the word *pāṣa* alone is employed: *sā grāhyāḥ (nirṛtyāḥ, abhūtyāḥ, etc.) pāṣān mā moci*, xvi. 8. 1, 2, etc. This is not accidental; the word *pādḍiṣa* belongs to Yama and Mṛtyu, being restricted altogether to this use in the AV.; it does not occur with any other divinity or personification either in the RV. or AV., although the opportunities e. g. in connection with Varuṇa are very numerous: RV. i. 24. 14, 15; 25. 21; iii. 2. 7; vi. 74. 4; vii. 88. 7; x. 85. 24; AV. ii. 10. 1-8;

iv. 15. 6, 7, 9; vi. 121. 1; vii. 83. 3, 4; xiv. i. 19, 57, 58; 2. 49; xvi. 8. 26; xviii. 4. 70. In all these cases the *pāṣaḥ* or *pāṣāḥ* of Varuṇa, not the *pādḍiṣa* of Varuṇa, is spoken of. Similarly *druháḥ pāṣa*, not *druháḥ pādḍiṣa*, RV. vii. 59. 8; AV. ii. 10. 6; vii. 77. 2; xvi. 6. 10. There is therefore a genuine difference between the two words, and the persistent tradition of the schools, that *pad-* is identical with *pāda*, seems to be the only one which can at present be suggested. In fact, if we urge the parallelism between AV. v. 19. 12 and xii. 5. 15, it would seem as if the AV. itself defined *pādḍiṣa* as equal to *pad + ḍiṣa*. AV. xii. 5. 15 reads: *sā brahmajyātm devapīyām brahmagavy ādīyātmānā mṛtyōḥ pādḍiṣa ā dyati* 'that cow of the brahman, if robbed, binds the oppressor of Brahmans, the reviler of the gods, in the foot-fetter of death.' And AV. v. 19. 12: *yām mṛtāyā 'nubadhnānti kūḍyām padayōpanīm, tād vāi brahmajya te devā upastīraṇam abruvan*. The parallelism between *mṛtyōḥ pādḍiṣa* and the symbolic *kūḍī padayōpanī*, which is tied to the dead person, is striking, and would seem to defend the translation 'the kūḍī-fetter, which clogs the steps,' given by Ludwig, *Rig-Veda* iii. 452. But Roth, *Festgruss an Böhrlingh*, pp. 98-99, translates the expression by 'the bunch of wood which effaces footprints,' and the decision depends upon the much discussed root *yup*: see Ludwig, RV. v. 614; Whitney, *Am. Journ. Phil.* iii. 402; *Proc. A. O. S.*, October, 1888, vol. xiv., pp. vii-viii. I incline to Roth's view¹ and would only remark that *kūḍī* in itself does not mean either 'bunch of wood' or 'fetter,' but is equivalent to the plant *badarī*. The word occurs in addition to AV. v. 19. 12, and at Kāuṣ. 21. 2, 13; 35. 24; 47. 30; 71. 19; 80. 33; 86. 24. Both Dārila and Keçava gloss it as above; and the expressions *kūḍīprāntāni* 21. 2; 35. 24, and *kārsvām kūḍy-upastīrṇāyām* at 47. 30, show that a plant is indeed meant: cf. *darbhaprāntāni*, common throughout the ritual literature.

Pischel's investigation of the word *saṁdāna* (ibid. p. 233) leads him to the conclusion that this word is the Indian word for 'foot-fetter.' This can be admitted without denying that *pādḍiṣa* had primarily the same value. One may also grant—though the reasoning on this point is decidedly subjective—that horses were

¹ In support of this I would refer especially to Sāyana's commentary on Tāit. Ār. vi. 10. 6; cf. also Rājendralālamitra in the introduction, p. 50. In a future paper the writer hopes to settle for good the prolonged dispute about the meaning of the root *yup*.

not tied by the feet in India (ibid. p. 234);¹ this simply necessitates the assumption that *padbhiṣa* when employed in such connection has assumed the secondary value of 'fetter,' which it evidently has at TB. i. 6. 10. 3; Mantra-Br. i. 3. 10.

Bartholomae, ibid. p. 3, considers the change of *padbhiḥ* to *padbhiṣ* as phonetically impossible. I do not regard the case as desperate. In Vedic *puroḍācam* and *anaḍva(z')ham*, the cerebral *ḍ* in my opinion is due to the influence of the palatal sibilant in the syllable following. This would explain the *ḍ* of *padbhiṣa*.² We may assume further that the expression *padbhiṣ catūrbhiḥ*—there is especial occasion to employ the plural of the word 'foot' with this numeral—was so frequent as to be felt a compound (cf. the very old *catuṣpad*), and that the *ḍ* owes its cerebral quality to the *ṣ* of the following syllable. In other words, *padbhis* and *padbhiṣ* are originally syntactical doublets, which became confused in due time. The cerebral of *pad-grbhi* must have been introduced secondarily from *padbhiṣ*. We may remember in this connection that Ascoli, *Vorlesungen über die Vergleichende Lautlehre*, p. 196, accounts for the cerebralization of *paḍ* on the ground of popular (Dravidian) influence. So also Weber, *Ind. Stud.* ii. 88.

The views of the writer differ from those of his predecessors, especially in the following points: 1. The claim that *padbhis*—*padbhiṣ* has adverbial value: 'quickly, nimbly,' and the like. 2. While admitting a second *padbhis* from stem *paṣ-* 'eye,' the existence of a third *padbhis* from *pac-* 'rope' is denied. 3. In pointing out that there is an essential difference between *padbhiṣa* (and its variants) and other words for 'fetter, shackle.' 4. In attempting to justify the writing *padbhiṣ* as a genuine phonetic product from *pād-* 'foot.'

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

¹ See now Ludwig, *Ueber Methode bei Interpretation des Rig-Veda Textes*, p. 68.

² For similar phenomena, involving changes in dental sibilants owing to the presence in a neighboring syllable of palatal and lingual sibilants, see Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfectums*, p. 494 fg., and Bloomfield and Spieker, *P. A. O. S. May*, 1886, p. xxxvi fg. (*Journal*, vol. xiii., p. cxvii fg.). A different explanation of *puro-ḍāc* and *anaḍ-vāh*—I cannot but believe an incorrect one—is to be found in Ascoli's *Kritische Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 285 fg. Still another explanation of *anaḍ-vāh* (*anaḍ-* = *anart-*, *anard-*) is advanced by Joh. Schmidt, *Die Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra*, p. 179. Cf. also Whitney, *Sk. Gr.* 151b.

NOTE.

CIRIS 470-472.

Iam procul e fluctu Salaminia suspicit arua
Florentisque uidet iam Cycladas : hinc uenus illi
Sinius hinc statio longe patet Hermionea.

Heyne's correction, *Sunion*, was partly adopted, partly altered by Haupt, who conj. *sinus* for *uenus* and *Sunius* for *Sinius*. It is difficult to see how the bold foreland Sunium could in any way be called *sinus*. It had occurred to me that *Venus* was right, and that *Sunias* described some temple or statue of her at Sunium. But of this I have not been able to find any trace, Poseidon being the only god connected with the locality.

Possibly the word of which *uenus* is a corruption was *Ceos*. Scylax in his Periplus, 58, 59, speaking of the islands off the Attic coast says κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀττικὴν εἰσὶ νῆσοι αἱ Κυκλάδες καλούμεναι, καὶ πόλεις αἶδε ἐν ταῖς νήσοις· Κέως· αὕτη τετράπολις καὶ λιμὴν, Κορησία, Ἰουλίς, Αἶραι· Ἐλένη, Κύθνος νῆσος, etc., and Dicaearchus, Descript. Graeciae, 135, describes Ceos as lying under or off Sunium :

ἐγγὺς Κέως πρώτη τετράπολις Σούνιον
Νῆσος ὑπόκειται καὶ λιμὴν.

Ceos might therefore fitly be called *Ceos Sunias*. Equally well might Hermione be selected as the corresponding westward point in the progress of the ship that dragged after it the unhappy Scylla. Scylax describes in order Hermione, and the promontory which adjoins it on the east, Scyllaeum, in the following words, 52, μετὰ δὲ Ἑρμιῶνά Σκύλλαϊον ἐστὶν ἀκρωτήριον τοῦ κόλπου τοῦ πρὸς Ἰσθμόν· ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ Σκύλλαϊον τῆς Τροιζηνίας· καταντικρὺ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ Σούνιον ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Ἀθηναίων χώρας.

Hermione and Scyllaeum are in a line with each other, and with no place of any importance between. But Scyllaeum would scarcely be mentioned by the poet, as it had at the time no name, Scylla giving it her name only after the tragic story of her death. Hermione, therefore, remains as the natural point on the west corresponding to Ceos and Sunium on the east. I would read then:

hinc Ceos illi
Sunias, hinc statio longe patet Hermionea.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Essai comparatif sur l'origine et l'histoire des rythmes. Par MAXIMILIEN KAWCZYNSKI. Paris, Bouillon, 1889. 220 pp. 8vo.

If we judge by the name of the author of this treatise we can safely assume he is a Slav. If we consider his doctrines philosophically developed we can see at once that he brings to his work a mind unfettered by the traditions of Western scholarship. The laborious effort of the Celt and Teuton to construct what he considers to be unnatural theories meets with little sympathy from him. To their conclusions he applies the measure of common sense (he does not say this in so many words, but yet we feel it everywhere in his calm logic), and finds them on all sides deficient. Accordingly he makes short work of the perverted views of modern civilisation. He starts from the standpoint of reason, and fortifies himself with the teachings of the ancients, whom he apparently respects to a certain degree.

Without delaying to write a preface, M. Kawczynski unfolds at once the principles underlying his work. Rhythmical phenomena, which regards the form of things and not their substance, may coincide, as has been claimed, with certain movements of nature, the falling of a leaf or the beating of the heart. But we are certain of rhythm only as it is expressed in the historical domain of art, of art relating to movements. There we find a fundamental condition of rhythm to be equality of parts, at first of all, afterwards of pairs. While natural symmetry is the law, yet psychological symmetry can exist in poetry as well as in the arts of repose. The origin of rhythm is then to be sought in a regular succession of equal parts. What further forms the essential nature of rhythm must be determined by careful investigation, for it is more than probable that the modern notion of rhythm is not the primary conception. Thus the view advanced by Wilhelm Meyer of Speyer that Latin rhythmical poetry is derived from accented Syriac verse (a view criticised later by M. Kawczynski), or the theory of those who hold that there existed a primitive Aryan poetry founded on accent, show a serious defect in method, in that their advocates are too easily satisfied with superficial comparisons. To recognize analogy the principle must be first known, otherwise the superstructure has no foundation. And it must be also borne in mind that, while the historical sciences have many axioms, they also assume many hypotheses, which, when they are considered near at hand, are found not to be logical principles, but rather vague and pre-conceived ideas, due to sentiment and obstructive of the search after true laws. But while our crusader would gladly attack these false positions along the whole line, he limits himself for the present to the notions regard-

ing rhythm. To combat these he presents two kinds of arguments, the negative and the positive, beginning with the former.

The theory that there existed among the Aryans, previous to their migrations, a system of verse is propped up by giving to the verses of sixteen syllables in the Vedic and Sanscrit the same origin as the Saturnian verse of the Romans and the long verse of early Germanic and Anglo-Saxon poetry. Hence the *glokas* of the Sanscrit epic would be conformable to the *rann* of early Irish poetry. But the verses of the Irish poetry are of fourteen syllables, or twice seven syllables, and are separated from the Vedic by rime and alliteration. These latter features hold true also of the long Anglo-Saxon and Germanic verse, which, indeed, has no definite number of syllables. Nor is the measure of the Saturnian verse counted by syllables, and M. Kawczynski agrees with the grammarians of antiquity in considering this verse to be but an imperfect imitation of the Greek metrical verse. Finally, the hexameter, a supposed descendant of the Aryan system, is based on the notion of the rhythmical foot, unknown to its assumed relatives. Thus disappears one argument of the sentimentalists.

A side-thrust at the theories of Scandinavian mythology follows. The Edda is not only different in its underlying conception from the Rig-Veda, but has no counterpart in Slavic tradition, which is nearer the primitive source. Hence it must have been derived from the West, from Rome and Greece, as its twelve deities indicate. But this in passing. The main point of the second negative argument is that the primitive state of man, far from being an Age of Gold, was a period of utter wretchedness and barbarism, little calculated to foster art. Art implies a certain conception of existence and a knowledge, however limited, of facts, which cannot belong to a society entirely without cultivation. Hence poetry, music and the dance cannot be autochthonous. For (repeating the argument in another form) a verse is an arrangement of parts and syllables according to definite rules, which rules assume analysis of language, thought. Nor can music be spontaneous, as is seen by examples of the present day; it must be acquired by practice. In like manner the dance is an art to be learned. Rhythm is certainly unknown to Sanscrit literature.

The source of the autochthonous theory of art is to be found in national pride. It is essentially modern, started by Bishop Percy, and was not suspected either by the ancients or by the men of the Middle Ages. And as a matter of fact our present art, whether architecture, music or poetry, is the survival of mediaeval art with additions from the Renaissance, which drew from the Greek and Roman world. The department of popular literature most developed reveals in many cases a definite and individual source for popular tales in Sanscrit literature, where they are confessedly of learned origin, being due to priests. The same may prove true of the other branches of folk-lore when scientifically established.¹

Having thus exposed the weakness of his opponents, M. Kawczynski

¹ M. Kawczynski might have here fortified his position by showing that among the people the point of the story was often lost (this is particularly true of the American negroes) and its moral generally misapplied. He applies further on a similar line of argument.

turns to the positive side of his argument and develops carefully his views, based on reason and confirmed by ancient tradition, his two guides in this matter. Every initiative, he affirms, is personal. Every invention is personal, the product of a mind superior to its fellows, and not of the crude mass of mankind. So the Greeks made their gods inventors. Over against the few inventive men of genius stands the crowd of imitators, who adopt their views more or less imperfectly. The people neither invents nor is changed save from the outside. It is the few who thus create in the process of centuries a language and establish schools of art and literature. If this imitation of the few by the many be admitted, then popular forms are posterior to artistic, however primitive be the latter. In like manner the less civilized nation is seen always seeking the arts and knowledge of the more cultivated, and instances are obvious when clothes, arms, religion and even language have been adopted. To illustrate by a point in question, that of poetry, the Germans of the ninth century so followed after Latin metres that Otfried states nothing was written in German.¹

With this evidence admitted, the existence of an ancient German epic is seriously menaced in spite of the testimony of Tacitus and Eginhard. A much more probable source for it can be found in the adaptation to historical events of the outlines of the Trojan war, both from the Aeneid and the Latin Iliad, and in the remains of Greek mythology. The career of Siegfried is that of Jason with elements derived from Achilles and Perseus. The Nibelungen verse may be modeled on the alexandrine. Rome was the social and political ideal of the mediaeval world. Troy was the traditional birthplace of both Frank and Celt. The earliest period of German literature is an imitation of Latin models, the succeeding one of French and Provençal. There is no reason to except the epic alone from the rule.²

Proceeding from this consideration of early German literature, M. Kawczynski notes the interdependence of modern literary movements and quietly pays his respects to the theory of Taine, which he would allow to be applicable to ancient Egypt only. He admits that the nations while borrowing have transformed the ideas received and adapted them to new surroundings. Thus the Fates of the Greeks have become the fairies of the Latin races and the swan-maidens of the German. The natural conditions which differentiate peoples have affected their literature only so far as the choice, the treatment or the particular preference given to this or that side of a subject are concerned. But these impulses came from the leaders, the few. They prove not only that historical influences are stronger than natural surroundings, but that, the same social forces having been always in action, prehistoric influences must be taken into account, excavations

¹ . . . dum a propriis nec scriptura, nec arte aliqua ullis est temporibus exposita. Quippe qui nec historias suorum antecessorum ut multae gentes ceteras, commendant memoriae, nec eorum gesta vel vitam ornant dignitatis amore. Letter to the Archbishop of Mainz.

² Throughout all these preliminary remarks, which constitute an Introduction in fact, the Germanic epic attracts especially the author's attention. He abandons it at this point to return at the end of the volume (p. 207), where he states that circumstances have compelled him to defer the presentation of his views on a like popular theme: the manner and the time of the formation of Scandinavian mythology.

revealing the presence of foreign merchants among barbarous peoples at a very early epoch. So arts were trafficked in and ideas were lent and borrowed, and the past and the present are bound together by a thousand ties, invisible but indissoluble. To prove the validity of this reasoning by the study of the history of rhythm is the object of the successive chapters of the treatise, thus introduced in so striking a manner.

Ch. I. *Le vers est issu de la proposition et le vers rythmique est né du vers syllabique.*¹—The origin then of rhythm is unknown, but it is reasonable to suppose that it is to be found in that art in which it is most prevalent, the verse, and that rhythm is the product of an observation made upon the verse, is in fact an invention. That rhythm is not an offspring of music, as is generally held, seems evident from the opinion that music must have originally consisted in the song, the verse, and thus music is later than the verse. Now three kinds of verse are handed down by tradition: metrical, syllabic and irregular. The last, the least perfect, must have been the first in chronological order, and, though not preserved by the Greeks, can be found among other Aryan peoples of a later date but of a primitive state of cultivation. On the same ground of relative perfection the syllabic would precede in point of time the metrical verse.

The point at issue is, therefore, the origin of the irregular verse. It is probable that it came from the form of language which most resembles it, the proposition, the expression of an opinion. And indeed the earliest verses show this parallelism, overflow being a later invention, which is periodically attacked by the purists, thus showing the innate aversion to it. But the object of the first verses was worship. They were prayers and incantations, which implied experience in the service of the gods and hence were due to priests. The most primitive form of worship is found in the prayers of the Arval brothers.

The second step in the evolution of the verse was to make the propositions equal in length, thus giving them in the rude minds of their hearers greater value. The Merseburger Zaubersprüche are an instance in point and reveal an attempt at five accented words in a verse. This was doubtless followed by an effort to make the verses equal in the number of words, a more apparent harmony than an equal number of syllables, the proposition being written as a whole in manuscripts still extant. Thus in the Saturnian verse, already considered, the base is in fact the word, the word being a rough imitation of the Greek metre which served as model. This notion again appears in the Toulouse rhetorical school of the sixth century. After counting the words came the count of the syllables, a task which Otfried himself found difficult when he applied it to the German tongue. But his verse shows a careful cultivation of rime, as he indeed declares, while the notion of accent is entirely absent. His model was perhaps the leonine hexameter, so frequent at the time, and his strict observance of the rime without regard to the exact number of syllables has its counterpart in

¹ Inasmuch as M. Kawczynski has thrown the headings of his chapters into the form of theses I may be pardoned for preferring his own words to a translation. The many points of interest which he discusses or indicates, coupled with the concise and argumentative presentation of his theories, render the task of a reviewer unusually arduous.

later crude imitations of the French octosyllable. This last step, a fixed number of syllables, was the hardest to take.

There remains to be considered the evolution of rhythmical verse. The ancients were peculiarly sensitive to the duration of syllables, a fact attested by Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and distinguished accurately the long from the short in their alphabet and script. The verse having advanced through the various degrees of perfection noted above to a form consisting of a fixed number of syllables, it can be supposed that an inventive genius, endowed with a delicate ear, happened on one composed entirely of long syllables and thus apparently longer than the others (a supposition treated as a fact in *las Leys d'Amors* (xiv c.)). Likewise one made up accidentally of short syllables would seem too short. This inventor, a priest without doubt, would seek to gain the favor of his deity in harmonizing the differences by a union of the two and thus create two verses of long and short syllables alternating, conformable to the law of equality already enounced. The notion of rhythm being absent from Sanscrit literature, this process can be attributed safely to the Greek genius, to which the great development of rhythm is certainly due. Definitions of rhythm quoted by M. Kawczynski from many Greek writers support this view of its origin. But, according to Quintilian and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, rhythm and foot are equivalent terms. Greek tradition designates the dactyl as being the original foot, but, since it contracts in Homer into a spondee, the trochee or the iambus is more probable.

Ch. II. *Le mètre n'était originairement qu'une mesure, un terme fixe du rythme.*—Notwithstanding the opinion of modern philology, metre and rhythm have the same principle, metre in fact being but a part of the rhythm, its measure, as the ancients affirm. They conceived rhythm as a long chain of equal links and metre as a definite part of the chain. Yet metre, based on syllabic verse in which were contained rhythmical feet, was the first invention.

Ancient tradition considered the earliest verse to be either the senarius, the tetrameter or the hendecasyllable. If the last, certainly posterior to the others, be excluded, there remain the two former, each of which fulfills the theoretical condition of utterance in one breath. The majority of the ancients seem to look upon the senarius as the older form, but the caesura of the tetrameter, which comes at the end both of the foot and the word, appears less artificial than that of the double senarius, which occurs in the middle of a foot. The caesura of the tetrameter also corresponds better to the division of a proposition into the subject and its modifiers on the one side and the predicate and its adjuncts on the other.

Another conception which appears wholly modern is that of the vocal ictus. On this subject the authors of antiquity are silent. Their testimony agrees in indicating by the beat of the foot or the rise and fall of the finger, and not by the voice, both the arsis and thesis. The ictus on the arsis is no other than a notion of Bentley elaborated by Hermann, who was led astray by the modern theory of rhythm in poetry, where the accented syllable takes the place of the long syllable of the ancients. In the same

manner the modern musical rhythm, in which the ictus has come to be a necessity, differs entirely from that of the ancient world, which was an alternation of long and short syllables.

Ch. III. *L'accent antique formait la mélodie du vers et semble avoir donné naissance au système musical grec.*—The errors of modern scholars regarding both the poetical and musical rhythm of classical civilisation having been pointed out, it is in order to show how ancient accent differed from modern accent. Accent (*accentus, adcantus*) in antiquity was the rise or fall of the voice on each syllable, the acute accent being the highest tone, the grave the least high, and the circumflex denoting the descent from one tone to another. In Greek there was also a fourth accent in contracted syllables, rising from the lower to the higher tone, from the grave to the acute. The Greek language was naturally very melodious and needed only the rhythmical verse to change the accents into a melody. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus the Greek accents were included in the space of a musical fifth, but this is evidently the extreme range, since early Greek music did not exceed in space a musical fourth. This statement M. Kawczynski illustrates by the first verse of the Iliad. Among the Romans also the few writers who touch on the subject admit the relation existing between accent and music, notwithstanding the popular attribution to the gods of the invention of music. To support this theoretical inference it is known that the early Greek lyre had three strings, corresponding probably to the three accents, the assumed source of music. M. Kawczynski finds also a confirmatory passage in Dionysius, who notes the fact that in a chorus of Euripides (in *Orestes*) the melody does not coincide with the accent, the words Σῖγα, σῖγα, λευκὸν being sung on the same tone in spite of the difference in accents. Furthermore the lyre of four strings contained the interval of a half-tone, which can be ascribed to the sliding accents of the Greek language alone, while the musical third may be due to the falling of the acute accent at the end of words. The doubling of the tetrachord must have given the melody an advantage over its parent, the accent, and this tendency was increased by the addition of two other tetrachords to this octachord, one above and the other below, and connected with it by a common note. Thus the system of Greek music was formed and in a way which renders the passage from Dionysius intelligible. The three Greek musical scales can be explained by the difference in accent between the Dorians, Phrygians and Ionians respectively.

It is interesting to contrast for a moment the theory and demonstration of M. Kawczynski, as applied to music, with those of the school which considers the movements of the human body and the human mind to set out from the same point as those of nature. Darwin, as is well known, states that music is the evolution of the amatory sounds uttered by the male in courtship. Mr. Herbert Spencer, returning to the subject in the November number of the Popular Science Monthly (1890), reviews his opinion formerly expressed and sums up his present position as follows: "Music has its germs in the sound which the voice emits under excitement, and eventually gains this or that character according to the kind of excitement." And as

a conclusion: "The origin of music as the developed language of emotion seems to be no longer an inference but simply a description of the fact." This is the theory of Darwin generalized. The principle is the same. Cries are the foundation of melody. How they become melodious and thus give rise to musical modulations is not explained other than by the very vague steps of evolution. Placing by the side of these indistinct views and absolute assumptions the careful and methodical research of M. Kawczynski indicates sufficiently the disparity of reasoning.

Passing to the study of the accents in themselves it is seen that they had no relation to the ictus or to the rhythm, but that their musical character was so inherent as to cause them to be used as signs of musical notation even in the Middle Ages. The difference which exists between ancient accent, a singing accent, and modern accent can be plausibly explained by the very development of the musical scale and the consequent bad taste of preserving a sing-song in ordinary speech. But there can be no doubt that modern music is derived from that of ancient Greece, since the presence of two scales and two half-tones in each identify them beyond question. Greek music was handed down to the Eastern Church, which transmitted it through Hilary, Ambrose and St. Augustine to the Western liturgy. Its uncertain and fluctuating forms were reduced to order by Gregory the Great and the rhythmical song found itself changed into the plain chant. The tenth century, by the introduction of harmony, witnessed a further transformation of the original scheme. The history of so-called popular music is identical, the various kinds now recognized being due both to the period and the choice made by each borrower among the nations.

Ch. IV. *La mesure rythmique ayant à répondre à trois différents objets, trois rythmizomena, a été amenée à une abstraction qui provoqua une séparation entre la rythmique et la métrique. Les Romains écartèrent cette division en soumettant les rythmes aux lois métriques.*—Musical and metrical rhythm being then the same in origin, there remains of the arts of movement the dance, which tradition shows closely united to both song and poetry. According to Plato and other writers of antiquity the dance was in essence the pantomimic representation of the thought of a verse. Its source may have been in the processions of the chorus. Later it escaped from the restraints of the text, but still remained subject to the law of rhythmical feet, long and short movements, as can be seen at the present day in the minuet, the fandango and various oriental dances. But in the pantomime, which was often restricted to gestures, the feet remaining motionless, it was impossible to mark an ictus, and hence no ictus existed. Thus all the arts of movement came from the proposition through the verse, and the syllable is the measure of the rhythm, according to the ancient tradition, but contrary to the opinion of Aristoxenus, who represented a new school and indicates a departure from the original practice. This departure, as Plato also notes, consisted not only in separating the dance from the music, but also in composing airs without a text, songs without words, which Plato considers in bad taste (*Laws* 670). A common measure for the three arts was then necessary, and it was obtained by reducing the syllabic measure

to an abstraction, preserving the form, the beat, while doing away with the text, the substance. In process of time this common measure received different names, metre when applied to poetry, rhythm when applied to music, a step which M. Kawczynski proves by a quotation from Servius.

The basis of classical metre and rhythm is the foot, measured either by syllables or beats. For the iambus the original rule demanded a short and long syllable, but Aristoxenus claimed for it three beats, and so on with the other feet. To determine the nature of a foot it must be repeated, and thus we reach a second unity in the double foot or colon. But the independent existence of the cola is lost when they become metres, as in the iambic or trochaic dimeter, and the metres once fixed preserve their form much better than the variable rhythms. So we find that the rules for metre are in fact the original rules for rhythm, and that the later metres can be easily distinguished from the earlier by the admission of later rhythmical feet, which were measured by beats before they were held down to the measure by syllables. All metres, however, were sung *κατὰ στίχον* in Greece, but probably were no longer sung in Rome.

It follows that rhythm, subject to the law of beats, possessed a much greater liberty of foot substitution than did metre, governed by syllables. As in metre, the rhythmical feet combined into cola (which, however, retained a certain independence), the cola into periods, the periods into strophes, and all these combinations as well as the original feet varied according to the taste of the poet (certain strophes, however, as the sapphic became fixed like the metres). As the nature of the foot is determined by its repetition, so is also that of the metre, and that of the strophe, whence arose in Greek songs strophe and antistrophe. But this natural order was perverted by artistic poets to a correspondence of the first and the last strophe, and so on until finally poems were written in which there were no corresponding strophes.

The Romans, in adopting the musical system of the Greeks, despaired of imitating their liberty of lyric verse, as is confirmed by both Cicero and Dionysius. Horace adhered to metrical regularity, and Seneca varied the song of his choruses only by intermingling the metres. And thus the inherent love for order and law in the Roman character is responsible for bringing together again metres and rhythms.

Ch. V. *La rhétorique latine contient quelques notions et quelques éléments particuliers qui se retrouvent dans la poésie latine et surtout dans la poésie du moyen âge.*—The artistic basis for poetry being now established, light can be thrown on its development in the West by the theories of rhetoric in vogue among the Latins, borrowed, however, from the Greeks. Poetical rhythm was introduced into orations by rhetoricians who were at the same time poets. Cicero attests (*De oratore* III 48) the presence of the cola of the dithyrambus, of vocal flexion—sing-song, to use the common phrase. This rhythm arose from the natural melody of the accents, strengthened by the introduction of musical cadences, and became finally an abuse against which Quintilian was obliged to protest (*Institutiones* XI 3). Its form approximated that of the verse, the first and last feet of the propositions

being conformable to rules, while the intermediate portion was free, Cicero's *numerosa cadere*.

The ancient treatises on rhetoric considered also the subject of rime, which some modern scholars, notably Wilhelm Meyer of Speyer deny to Latin poetry before Commodianus. Yet Plautus (*Menachmi* 20-29) uses final rimes, and Propertius leonine, and the books on rhetoric prove that these instances were intentional and not accidental. Cornificius recommends a moderate use of rime in orations and gives examples of two kinds, while the propositions equal in length, so frequent an ornament of rhetoric, often end in rime. Cicero states even that certain propositions demand a rhythmic cadence also rimed, whence came the transformation of the word *rhythmus* into the Provençal *rims*, meaning both rime and rhythm.¹ It seems then beyond question that the rime of the Middle Ages had its beginnings in the rhetoric of the Romans.

It is possible that mediaeval alliteration had also the same origin. Alliteration is found in Latin poetry, and the Romance idioms preserve many phrases which must have existed in the speech of the populace. Furthermore, the treatises on rhetoric blame the abuse of alliteration, especially in the middle of words. Of the two kinds, they consider the one, *adnominatio*, aided the sense of the words, while the other, *adlitteratio*, emphasized their sound. The former is probably the older, since it first consisted in repeating the same root with different prefixes and suffixes so as to impress the hearer, a process known also to the Rig-Veda and the Slavic. It is this kind which is most frequent in the Romance languages. A development of the *adnominatio*, due clearly to artistic effort, is the *adlitteratio*, which brings together words of supplementary meaning and similar sound. In the modern languages alliteration first appears in the poetry of the Germanic nations, where it seems indeed fundamental. But if it be admitted that it is not autochthonous, it must have been borrowed from the nations to the West, since alliteration, properly speaking, is unknown to the Slavs. A product of Latin cultivation, it could be communicated to the Germans by the manuals of rhetoric and the schools of Gaul. In the same way it could penetrate to the Irish and Anglo-Saxons, who in turn would extend its use through their missions on the Continent. Again, alliteration in German poetry may not be a principle but an ornament only, as it was among the Romans, though a passage from Isidore of Seville, praising the moderation of Vergil in its employment, anticipates already the later rule of the German writers. The medium through which all these attributes of Latin poetry passed into the modern languages—rime, alliteration, the adaptation of the hexameter to heroic Germanic verse—was the literature of the monastic schools, the intellectual guides of the Middle Ages. Yet alliteration can hardly be of Latin invention, since the rhetoricians frequently apply to it terms of Greek origin. It must therefore have been known to the Greeks, and Ebers claims even to have found both it and rime in Egyptian documents.

¹ This confusion seems to exist also in the mind of Du Bellay. See la Défense et illustration de la langue francoyse, Part II, c. vii.

Ch. VI. *La rythmique séparée de la métrique par la mesure abstraite du temps s'éloigne plus encore de son principe originaire sous la prédominance du chant, et tend à une transformation complète.*—Latin poetry, having changed Greek rhythmical periods into metrical verse, presented apparently no essential difference between rhythm and metre. Yet the Romans, in the transformation which the rhythmical principle received at their hands, insisted more and more on the law of beats in rhythms, as is explained at length by Quintilian. This law, given full play, allowed the mutual substitution of cola and of feet, provided the measure of beats was kept. Hence there was no place for the ictus claimed by the moderns. The difference between metre and rhythm was further increased in Rome by the influence of song, which freed itself from the restraints of the metrical law, as it had done in Greece from the law of accent, and which modulated the syllables of the text according to the effect desired, as is seen in St. Augustine. That rhythmical liberty was practiced by the ancients is sufficiently attested by Dionysius and Longinus. Therefore neglect of metre is not due to the corruption of speech, though the notion of quantity held back the innovators for some time and gave to the rhythms of the classical period the regularity of metres. When they began to break away from this confinement, the rhythmical tendency, noted above in the treatises on rhetoric, aided their escape. But the process went on gradually, and the writers who were witnesses of the evolution frequently confuse rhythm and metre. Hence the conclusion of M. Kawczynski, that each rhythmical scheme is based on a corresponding metrical one and that the seeming regularity of the former is due to the melody.

The rule for the number of syllables is first recorded by Diomedes in the third century. St. Augustine testifies to the loss of the feeling of quantity in his time. The notions of rhythm which Bede handed over to the Anglo-Saxons: number of syllables, alliteration, rime and rhythmical cadence, he derived from Latin poetry. It is only the later poets of the Middle Ages who appear to be guided by accent in the cadence but not in the interior of the verse. This interesting chapter is closed by a quotation from a Celtic glossary: *Sicut est rhythmus comparatus metro, sic sunt bardī comparati poetis doctis, sic sunt bardī sine mensura apud se (qui non didicerunt compositionem metricam) comparati poetis doctis.*

Ch. VII. *Les vers rythmiques sont calqués sur les mètres.*—The rhythmical forms of the Middle Ages are much more numerous than those of Horace and Seneca. This is due to the models found in the minor Latin poets of the post-classical period, to the stichic use of metrical verses, and to new strophic combinations which betoken a finical tendency. Here M. Kawczynski passes in review the poets from the third to the ninth centuries, together with the kinds of verse they used, the earliest popular verses of the Romans and the antiphony of Bangor. He then discusses the metrical models of the later syllabic system, beginning with the verse of four syllables derived by the middle rime from the octosyllable, which in turn is based, contrary to the view of Meyer, on the iambic dimeter. The verse of five syllables comes from the adonius, of six from the twelve-syllable verse

having a middle rime, of seven from the iambic dimeter catalectic, of nine, rare, from the alcaic enneasyllable, of ten having a caesura after the fifth syllable from the anapaestic trimeter, while the decasyllabic verse having the caesura after the fourth syllable is modeled on the dactylic trimeter hypercatalectic, the caesura absent in the metrical original being invented by the rhythmical poets to differentiate this verse from the first named. For the verse of eleven syllables there are three models, the alcaic and sapphic hendecasyllable, having a caesura after the fifth, and the phalaecean, which had no caesura, contrary to the opinion of Bartsch and others. The verse of twelve syllables is based on the old senarius, when the caesura comes after the fifth syllable, but when the caesura falls in the middle it is patterned on the asklepiad. The verse of thirteen syllables, a late form, is an imitation of the alexandrine having a feminine caesura, and that of fourteen syllables generally results from the doubling of the seven syllable. The verse of fifteen syllables is from the ancient septenarius, while that of sixteen, if its existence be admitted, is a doubling of the octosyllable. Thus each rhythmical verse has a metrical model, directly or indirectly, retains the typical number of syllables and the caesura, if any. The accent is the rule only at the caesura and cadence. These conclusions of M. Kawczynski may expect to meet with many objections from Romance scholars.

Ch. VIII. *Les formes libres et variables de la rythmique grecque du moyen âge transportées dans l'occident y ont été réduites peu à peu aux formes de la rythmique latine.*—The starting-point of this chapter is a review of W. Meyer's *Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung* (Abh. d. ph.-hist. Cl. d. bay. Ak. d. Wiss. XVII, ii), which claims a Semitic origin for rhythmical verse. But the Syrian poet, Ephrem, on whose writings the theory is based, did not draw his method from Semitic poetry but from Harmonius (iii c.), who, according to a Byzantine historian of the fourteenth century, was chosen as poet-laureate by his coreligionists because he knew Greek musical art. His songs, now lost, were written for two choruses, like the Greek lyrics. Furthermore it is now well established that Greek classical metres were already in the third century imitated by Christian poets writing subjective poetry, who transformed the metres into rhythms in much the same manner as did the Latins.

But a form of Byzantine poetry, the trope, has especial importance in Western literature. The trope, of which the earliest preserved was written by Justinian, varied in length from four to twenty cola. It became an essential part of the church office, adopted the features of the rhythmical verse, and in many instances shows by the marks of accents that these latter were signs of musical notation. The trope is often made up (a discovery of Meyer) of a proem, a strophe and an ephymnium, the last and first of varying length and form, while all indications point to a hesitating imitation of the lyric song. Introduced into the West as early as the ninth century, the use of the trope was authorized and recommended by Adrian II, and soon, under the name of sequences, it took on a great development, being gradually changed into rimed verses and strophes. Thus for a second time was Greek poetry reduced to order by the Latin mind.

After considering the many varieties of the sequence M. Kawczynski analyzes a curious system of versification, practiced in the sixth and seventh centuries by the rhetorical school of Toulouse, and handed down by one of the school, Virgilius Maro. Bombastic and obscure, this school bears a striking resemblance to the Symbolists of the present time and had a large following in its fondness for metaphor and metonymy. The poetical scheme adopted by the school demanded a fixed number of words for each kind of verse and that words of equal length occupy the same relative places in the verse, thus making the accents recur at the same point. Rime and a regular rhythmical cadence were also obligatory. Between this verse and the Byzantine trope there seems a close connection, in that the accents in each determine the melody, which must have been a monotonous chant, like that of the epic songs. M. Kawczynski points out the possibility that both these systems may be a survival of ancient tradition. What is certain is that the Toulouse school, much admired by Aldhelm, fostered among the Anglo-Saxons the notions of rime and alliteration. The musical value of the Latin accent as a sign disappeared, however, by the twelfth century.

Ch. IX. *La versification romane tire son origine de la rythmique latine, mais la plupart des formes lyriques romanes sont postérieures à l'introduction des séquences latines.*—Coming now to the origin of Romance versification, M. Kawczynski applies to it the same principles which guided him in the study of versification in general: common sense, tested by the earliest writers on the subject. *Las Leys d'amors* gives the definition of *rims* (*rhythmus*) as a fixed number of syllables having a final consonance. Accent was required to recur at the caesura and cadence but elsewhere to be free, as in Latin. The notion of the foot had disappeared finally in Latin rhythmical poetry and is not found at all in the Romance system, which, nevertheless, preserves the scheme of the ancient metrical verse: length by syllables, the caesura and the regular cadence. And though the Romance verses are not rhythmical in the technical sense of the word, they are nevertheless rhythms, the new force of accent producing in them a modulation. Their direct models may have been either the Latin rhythmical verses, the general case, or even the classical metres in certain instances, depending on the literary knowledge of the poet. But in Latin all the syllables of the last word were counted in the cadence, whereas in Provençal and French the enumeration stopped with the tonic syllable of the last word. This difference can be explained in French by the pronunciation, but not in Provençal, and this fact would seem to indicate the priority of French poetry and its consequent influence on the Provençal.

Italian versification is derived from the French and Provençal, as is attested by Antonio da Tempo in his treatise on the subject (1332). This writer also confirms the opinions expressed above, that the rules of prosody were taken from the works on rhetoric and that rhythmical poetry belongs to artistic literature. His position as regards Italian is manifestly true. For the verse scheme does not count all the post-tonic syllables, in accordance with both the Latin and the nature of the Italian language, but offers a compromise to French influence in counting but one syllable after the

tonic, producing thus the so-called *piano*, *tronco* and *sdrucchiolo* rimes. Italian poetry prefers also an odd to an even number of syllables, in which it coincides with the rule of music down to the fourteenth century.¹

In the same way M. Kawczynski shows, that the earliest Spanish verse is neither autochthonous nor derived directly from the Latin but is borrowed entirely from the French. Thus the latter is the common source of all Romance versification.

Should the same principle be applied to the strophic combinations of Romance lyric their origin would be Latin and artistic, not popular. Now at the time when Romance lyric appeared, the Latin lyric contained two distinct elements, the one of Roman origin, consisting of equal strophes and verse, the strophes having often a refrain either before or after the strophes, and the other of Byzantine origin, the sequence, in which at first the strophes were equal only by pairs while the verses or cola were unequal. From these two kinds proceeded the manifold creations of modern lyric. Thus the history of poetry is one: Greece acting on France, indirectly through Rome, or directly through the Church, and the mutual dependence of sacred and profane poetry is again demonstrated.

M. Kawczynski concludes, as he began, with a protest. Contemporaneous thought, he says, seeks to establish a complete homogeneity between physical and historical phenomena, and, to do so, subjects the latter to the former. But the one is the product of a blind causality; the other of a will seeking an end, finality. The terms are doubtless identical and physical laws may some day be proven to be final laws. Applying these principles to mankind, the origin of race comes within the domain of physical laws, while that of language is to be found only in the historical field. Language is an invention. Each new root is invented by some superior mind and afterwards accepted by the crowd. The origin of dialects, due to the separation of the peoples, is explained by the peculiarity of the pronunciation of some one leading man, taken up and propagated by the others.² Reasoning in like manner, popular poetry is not artistic poetry in its crude state, but rather a corruption of the artistic. Proofs for this statement can be adduced from Italy, where the strambotto is merely the remains of the tenzone, the ritornello of a volta, and the stornello of a motet, while at the present day in France the artistic romance and chanson continue to be the popular forms. So the Middle Ages developed music as it did poetry, but on ancient models; and Greek cultivation, if fully known, would be found to contain the germs of European civilisation. But to arrive at definite results, psychological laws must be applied to historical phenomena and must verify the historical method, as calculation verifies the phenomena of the physical world.

To criticise properly the study of M. Kawczynski demands a counter-

¹ From this point on M. Kawczynski devotes himself to the details of Romance versification, showing its interdependence and taking up successively its various forms. Fearing the effect on the reader of the already great length of this review, I have taken the liberty to transfer these especial points to the Modern Language Notes of January, 1891.

² This opinion was expressed and illustrated some years since by Arsène Darmesteter in a course of lectures at the Sorbonne.

article covering the whole subject from the beginning. His work forms a connected whole which leaves but few points exposed to attacks that do not assail his entire theory. The quotations from Greek and Latin writers, with which he buttresses his logic, are so numerous and varied that they can be accepted or rejected only after a diligent and most exhaustive research. Accordingly I have found myself compelled to submit but one side of the question, and to present what is in fact but an abstract of the volume before me. If in this I have done it justice—a difficult task, owing to the interdependence of the various questions discussed and to the close relation of the citations with the argument—the review will acquaint American students with the most important single work on versification which has appeared in recent times, revolutionary in theory and far-reaching in conclusions.

F. M. WARREN.

De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. Scripsit SERGIUS SOBOLEWSKI. Mosquae, MDCCCXC.

De vi et usu praepositionum ἐπί, μετά, παρά, περί, πρός, ὑπό apud Aristophanem. Scripsit IOANNES ILTZ. Halis Saxonum, MDCCCLXXX.

Professor Sobolewski's treatise is a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of Aristophanes. The best MSS are made the basis and a copious literature has been at the service of the author. The great lesson taught is the faithfulness of the comic poet to the prose standard of his time, though the lesson is no new lesson; for the Aristophanic scholar does not need to be told now-a-days¹ that not a solitary preposition is used by him otherwise than it would be used in prose, except for purposes of parody or paratragedy. Only in saying this we might seem to exclude from the list of Aristophanic scholars some editors of Aristophanes who do not think it worth while to notice exceptional syntax. Let us hope that after a time some of these things will get into the grammars, that some future Kaegi will note not only the scarcity of σύν in model prose as compared with μετά, but also the rarity of ἀνά and ἀμφί, will tell the schoolboy to what sphere of literature anastrophe belongs, and that Greek prose does not allow the preposition to be put between the adjective and the substantive—a liberty to which the novice in Greek is tempted by Latin examples.

Under the head of εἰς, ἐς Sobolewski follows the lead of Bachmann in making εἰς the only Aristophanic form before vowels—the nine examples of ἐς being accounted for by the tragic tone of the passages. In fr. 543, however, where Bachmann has ἐς because it is Ionic, S. denies with Meisterhans that ἐς is Ionic and writes with Bergk and Kock εἰς. The Dindorfian law of ἐς before consonants and εἰς before vowels is absolutely rejected by S., as E was written for EI down to 380 and ἐς is to be transliterated εἰς. Besides, he adds, if ἐς is the more elevated form before vowels, why should it lose that character when it is put before consonants? True, there are traces of ἐς in the old language, as is shown by the familiar formula ἐς κόρακας, as is shown by κᾶς, which cannot

¹ 'Modes of expression inadmissible in prose were equally inadmissible in comedy except when they were employed for malice prepense and to give color to the work' (Rutherford, N. P. p. 38).

come from *καὶ εἰς*, but in the height of Attic there was only one form and that was *εἰς*. As for Thukydides, Sobolewski does not believe that an author who, in spite of his *σεμνὸν γένος*, was careful not to use poetic constructions, or at any rate used them rarely, should have been more tragic in the use of *ἐς* than the tragic poets themselves. In the matter of *εἵνεκα* vs. *οὐνεκα* S. sides with Wackernagel against *εἵνεκα*. Under *διὰ* c. acc. he recognizes an instrumental signification—without a quiver of emotion. Some slight feeling at least would have been becoming even if I am wrong in my protest against the loose parallel often made, *διὰ* c. acc. = *διὰ* c. gen. See A. J. P. X 124, Pindar I. E. xcvi, and Justin Mart. Apol. I 53, 11, where I say that 'owing to' will cover all the cases of supposed confusion. Indeed, 'owing to,' 'thanks to,' will easily cover three of the four Aristophanic examples cited by Sobolewski. Pax 323: *διὰ τὰ σχήματα*, L. 936: *διὰ τὰ στρώματα*, Ec. 603: *διὰ τοῦτο*, and 'thanks to' in all these passages is 'a murrain on.' It is the same use of *διὰ* that we have in the phrase *εἰ μὴ διὰ* 'if it had not been for,' which gives the obstacle, not the means of prevention. When *διὰ* c. gen. is used the agency is purposeful, when *διὰ* c. acc. is used it is accidental. So explain Ec. 741: *διὰ τὸν ὄρθριον νόμον*. It did not lie in the design of the *κιθαρωδός* to wake up the man who thanks her for waking him up, any more than it lay in the design of the cock to wake Philokleon too late (Vesp. 100).

Under the head of *κατὰ* c. gen. S. discusses the famous passage Pax 241: *ὁ δεινός, ὁ ταλαύρινος, ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, but without a happy result. Theoretically *ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν* ought to mean 'the fellow that bears down on his legs.' This bearing down on the legs is a mark of the soldier's trade. It is not the *εὖ διαβὰς* . . . *ποσὶν ἀμφοτέρωσιν* of Tyrtaios, which has been cited. That is the attitude of the warrior in actual conflict, *χεῖλος ὁδοῦσι δακῶν*. This is the habitual gait of a man that has to stand guard for hours, that has to march as the ancient soldier had to march under heavy burdens, under loads which gave the man at-arms of antiquity swollen legs (see Pers. 5, 189; Juv. 6, 397) and straddling walk, so that the swagger of the Pyropolinices of the old time was not simply the moral but also the physical result of his business. With this expression I am tempted to connect the *κατασκελής* of Dionysios Hal. (Iud. Isocr. 3), which is rendered 'dried up,' though Sylburg divined its meaning, as he shows by his version 'claudicans.' 'Dried up' does not apply to Isokrates, and if *κατασκελής* can mean 'straddling,' and so 'rocking,' we have an admirable adjective for the deliberate, swaying, processional style of Isokrates, to say nothing of the comfort that always comes from making two difficult passages explain one another. But if *κατασκελής* cannot mean *κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν*, in the sense attached to it here, it may denote 'leggy,' 'big-legged,' as *κατάκνημος* means 'calfy,' *κατάκομος* 'hairy,' *κατάσαρκος* 'fleshy'; *καταπύγων* it is not necessary to translate, and *καταπώγων* is 'beardy.' The big, swollen legs are the consequence of much standing and the cause of much straddling.

Under *ἐπὶ* c. gen. S. rejects Krüger's distinction between *ἐπὶ* c. gen. and *ἐπὶ* c. dat. in a local sense (I 68, 41, 1), a distinction which, it is true, might well be reversed theoretically as well as practically, for we should expect the natural position to be expressed by *ἐπὶ* c. gen., the unnatural by the dat. Fixity of position is in fact often denoted by *ἐπὶ* c. gen. (see my Justin Martyr Apol. I 26, 15), and it is not impossible that there may be some such feeling

as we have in regard to *ἐπὶ* c. gen. and *ὑπὸ* c. dat. In refutation of Krüger S. points triumphantly to Eq. 783: *ἐπὶ ταῖσι πέτραις καθήμενον* compared with v. 754: *ὅταν ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ καθῆται τῆς πέτρας*, but he might have claimed here, not mere indifference, but, if one must refine, reversal. It would be easy to make Demos wriggle in the one passage and sit quiet in his 'fixed normal position' in the other. At any rate, the genitive is much more common in Attic daily speech than the dative, as S. shows, though, as he also notes, Rutherford is wrong in denying *ἐπὶ* with dat. in this sense to Attic (Babrius, p. 7).

Under *παρά* S. recognizes no distinction between *παρά* c. dat. and *παρά* c. acc., and it must be confessed that it may seem an over-refinement to give *καθεύδειν παρά τινι* the personal sense and *καθεύδειν παρά τινι* the physical sense—the one 'in one's bed,' the other 'alongside of'—but for prose the distinction seems to hold. *παρά* is characteristic locality (Fr. *chez*), with gen. 'from which,' with dat. 'at which,' with acc. 'to which.' *παρά* 'along,' 'by the side of,' has no personal significance. One says *παρ' ἐμὲ καθήμενος* (Plat. Euthyd. 271 A) as one says *παρὰ πόδας μου* (Protag. 310 C), but *παρ' ἐμοί* is not 'by my side,' it is 'in my room' (l. c. 310 B). Needless to say, genitives and datives when found with *παρά* are always persons in Aristophanes, three exceptional datives being one a quotation, one parodic, one anapaestic, and the gen. in Ach. 68 being more than doubtful. *περί* c. gen. and *περί* c. acc. are kept as well apart in the borderland as could be expected. One cannot always separate 'speaking and thinking' from 'behavior.' There are some pretty examples of *ὑπὸ* with gen. of inanimate objects, which Mr. Hickie, who made that a test of purity of style, would have done well to heed when he was working at Aristophanes and before he had emptied his grammatical learning on the unoffending head of Andokides (see A. J. P. VI 487). But what was to be a 'Brief Mention' has expanded into something more than a 'Book Notice,' and I will stop before it becomes something more than a 'Review.'

Sobolewski undertakes to cover the whole ground of the prepositions. Itz in his dissertation limits himself to the prepositions that take three cases. He is much more reserved in his statement than Sobolewski, and goes no further than the safe declaration: *Aristophanis dicendi rationem propius ad prosaicorum quam ad poetarum usum accedere*. If the author had contented himself with mere references to the passages, the dissertation would have shrunk into very modest dimensions, but the reader will be very glad to have the material for criticism so ready at hand, as, for example, p. 17, in which the local use of *ἐπὶ* c. dat. 'on' is treated in the most mechanical way, without any remark about context, without any discrimination of meaning. We could learn quite as much from a concordance. Some of the passages are highly lyrical, some of them show the sense of 'addition to,' 'heaped on,' but they are all despatched with the sentence: 'Cum dativo *ἐπὶ* praep. multis locis ita usurpatur ut ab *ἐπὶ* c. gen. nullo fere modo differat at aequae rem aliquam in summa aliqua re versari indicet,' which might be true for Thucydides (see Kümmell, de praep. *ἐπὶ* usu Thucydideo), but is not necessarily true of Aristophanes. Occasionally there is an attempt at criticism, as where he favors *ἐν* against *ἐπὶ* in Plut. 337-8: *λόγος γ' ἦν . . . πολλὸς | ἐν τοῖσι κορυφαίοις*. For this he claims the authority of V, not recorded in the apparatus, and of Cobet. He might have claimed Porson and von Velsen as well, but there is no valid

objection to *ἐπὶ*. The talking customers would naturally sit outside. See Isocr. 18, 9: καθίζων ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐργαστηρίοις λόγους ἐποιεῖτο, though, of course, Cobet would change here also (VL 282). See other passages cited by Blaydes. In brief it must be said that, apart from some convenient statistics, no considerable furtherance of our knowledge has been noted in Itzl's ninety pages.

B. L. G.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, erklärt von ADOLF KIESSLING. Erster Teil. Oden und Epoden. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1890. Preis 3 Mark.

Six years have passed since Kiessling published his first edition of the odes and epodes of Horace; during that time he has given us the satires and also the epistles. He has now turned his attention to a rather thorough revision of the first part of the whole work, and the results of his labor lie before us.

As he tells us in his preface to this second edition, the commentary appears "in vielfach berichtigter und erweiterter Form," not an unfamiliar story, and one which it is safe to believe is not always too welcome to the book-owner, especially if (as happens not infrequently, though not in this case) the second, much enlarged edition appears so soon after the first as to leave but little time for the enjoyment of possession. To the scholar, however, even if an owner of the first edition, all real improvement will be welcome, and improvement Kiessling has given us in this edition, for the words of the preface are not idle ones, and a careful study will easily reveal many additions and a number of corrections.

These changes in the commentary are of three kinds: (1) changes in the wording; (2) additions; (3) abridgments. Of the third class there are not many cases and these are generally of minor importance. Of the first kind we find examples throughout the book from the introduction on, so he has changed e. g. on page 3 of the introduction the words "führte dazu zu versuchen" to "führte zu dem Versuche"; on I 4, 5 he has changed "beachte den beabsichtigten malerischen Gegensatz" to "Der malerische Gegensatz ist beabsichtigt." In the same way the didactic tone of "Beachte den wirkungsvollen Kontrast," etc., in his note on III 3, 13, is changed to "Wirkungsvoll tritt die Auffahrt des Bakchus und Romulus dem *eniti* gegenüber." I 2, 13 . . . des Tiber, der '*vorticibus rapidis et multa flavus arena*' durch Rom *strömt*, has suited K. better than . . . *fließt*. As foreign a word as 'Kakophonie' must be made to go and 'Missklang' is substituted instead. But this tendency to correct is not without its nemesis: in his note on I 8, 1 "*cur*" fragt nicht nach dem Motiv sondern nach der Ursache . . . the new edition reads "*cur*" fragt nicht nach der Ursache, sondern nach der Ursache, etc. A decidedly more idiomatic rendering is given in the summary of I 8, 1, where "Bei allen Göttern, Lydia," etc., is changed to "Um Gotteswillen, Lydia," etc.

But changes of this sort, which are found throughout the book, although they often improve it, yet are of minor importance to the student as compared with the many additions which Kiessling has made to his notes. These are either continuations of already existing notes, throwing more light on the subject commented on, or they are entirely new, dealing with things not touched

upon in the old edition. The smallest number of these additions seems to have been made in the epodes. Examples of entirely new notes are the following: On I 6, 4, on "quam rem cumque ferox . . . miles te duce gesserit," he has added a note on gesserit, saying that it is the subj. perfect and that it is dependent on scriberis, the opening word of the ode, and he compares "spectandus . . . quantis fatigaret ruinis IV 14, 19"; most editions leave it an open question as to what form gesserit is. On ep. V 3 the following note is added: "iste, sc. vester, die einzige Steele der lyrischen Gedichte in der sich *iste* findet"; on ep. XIV 4, to his note on trahere is added "*trahere* stärker als ducere (I 17, 22), wie ἐλκεῖν Aristoph. Ritter 167, vom kräftigen 'Zuge' des 'Zechers.'" Amplifications of already existing commentary are met with frequently and they have generally been judiciously made.

To the first class of changes might be added the corrections which have been made here and there in the book, but which are not very numerous; an example is found in his commentary on the first ode of the collection, on I 1, 3 he has changed the word "olympischen" to "isthmischen" in speaking of IV 3; III 5, 50 the evident misprint parabat has been corrected to pararet.

Of changes in the text but few are to be noticed: in the corrupt passage II 4, 10, he has changed the reading limen Apuliae to limina Pulliae, following Porphyryon in supposing that Horace is referring to his nurse and not to his native land; in ep. I 9 a different punctuation has been adopted, changing the sense. On the other hand, by misprint a punctuation has slipped in I 26, 17, where a period has been put after putris. Such misprints, exasperating as they may be to the author, are not so troublesome to the student as the reading e. g. conveni et for conveniet, found in Maclean's (Chase's) edition of the odes III 3, 69. In the commentary on epod. VIII 15 the form mant has been allowed to replace amant.

But the number of these inevitable errors is small, and we can safely say that the book marks a decided improvement on what was in itself an excellent edition, and will be a welcome addition to the many already existing commentaries on the odes and epodes of Horace.

EDWARD H. SPIEKER.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von DR. EUGEN KÖLBING, Heilbronn.
X Band, 1887.

I.—C. Horstmann, *Mappula Angliae*, by Osbern Bokenham, prints a hitherto unpublished translation by this Middle-English author, from the Latin of Higden's *Polycronicon*, Bk. I, ch. 39 to the end of the book. This version was probably made about 1440, while Trevisa's was finished in 1387. Still another dates from the latter half of the fifteenth century. A comparison of these three renderings is interesting to the linguist. The twenty two chapters of his original have been compressed by Bokenham into fifteen, but to these he has prefixed an introduction and added an epilogue, making seventeen in all. The initials of these chapters, with the exception of the first, constitute the letters of his name, as he himself explains at the end of his work.

C. Horstmann, *On Chronology*. This is a short tractate, written in 1445, and contained in the same manuscript as the *Mappula Angliae*. It follows directly upon the *Mappula*, in the hand of the second scribe employed upon the latter.

Julius Zupitza, *On Lay le Freine*. Notes and emendations to the Middle-English poem.

H. Klinghardt, *Techmer's and Sweet's Proposals for the Reform of Instruction in English*. A summary of the improvements advocated by these two authorities.

Leon Kellner, *The Source of Marlowe's Jew of Malta*, gives reasons for supposing that Marlowe was acquainted with the adventures of Juan Miquez, or Johannes Michesius, a Portuguese Jew, who eventually took the name of Josef Nassi, and that the story of his life may have suggested to Marlowe the conception of his *Jew of Malta*. This story is outlined and references to other authorities are cited. Of the latter only two need be mentioned: Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 9. 400 ff., and Ersch und Gruber, *Encyclopädie*, II, 2. th., p. 202 ff. Besides this discovery there are a number of interesting notes upon the play.

The Book Notices review, among other works, Ten Brink's *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, Baskervill's edition of Andreas, Ramhorst's dissertation on Andreas and Cynewulf, Wülker's *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Litteratur*, and Schipper's *William Dunbar*. Among the school-books noticed is Sweet's *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*.

In the *Miscellanea* there is a paper on metre, by Schipper, and an appreciative obituary of Henry Bradshaw.

II.—M. Adler and M. Kaluza, *Studies in Richard Rolle de Hampole*. This article, which forms Part III of a longer monograph, is upon the paraphrase of the Seven Penitential Psalms which has been hitherto ascribed, on the strength of its title in the Digby MS, to Richard Rolle, though the Rawlinson MS in the Bodleian contains an insertion which is inconsistent with that assumption. A part of the latter is:

By frere Richarde Maydenstoon,
In Mary ordre of þe Carme,
þat bachilere is in dyuynite.

The relations of the three MSS are discussed, the metre and rime, the dialect, and finally the author. The dialect forbids its ascription to Richard Rolle, and seems to be in the way of allowing us to accept Richard Maidenstone as the translator, the former having written in the Yorkshire dialect, and the latter having been a Kentishman, while the dialect of the translation appears to be East Midland. Appended to the investigation is the version itself, here for the first time printed. The text is that of the Digby MS, and the variants from the other two are given at the foot of the page.

W. Sattler, *Zur Englischen Grammatik*, VII, deals with some peculiarities of the English plural, with copious examples.

Among the most important Book Notices are reviews of Sweet's *Oldest English Texts* and Dieter's *Ueber Sprache und Mundart der ältesten Englischen Denkmäler*, Herford's *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, Techmer's *Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, and Sievers' *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, third edition.

Noticeable among the articles of the *Miscellanea* is one on *The Modern Languages in America*, by Prof. Horatio S. White, of Cornell. This is an excellent paper, tracing the growth of modern language study in this country, the founding of the Modern Language Association, and the establishment of Modern Language Notes. A few sentences may be quoted:

"The position of English is peculiar. Formerly taught principally in its relations to literary thought and expression, an increasing demand has become felt for more thorough instruction in the literature and historical development of that language; and at the present time it is generally recognized that to English studies a prominent place is rightfully due, and such a place they are rapidly gaining in the collegiate course."

"The present attitude in America towards the whole question would seem to be this: Let equal rights and equal privileges be granted in the educational system to the ancient classics, to the modern languages, and to the natural sciences: Let the student be at liberty within certain wise limits to choose his own course. The contest will then result in a friendly and generous rivalry to advance in common the boundaries of knowledge, and the future may safely be left to take care of itself."

"It would not be far from the truth to assert that the ordinary college graduate in the United States has received no better training in the modern languages than is gained by the graduate of the German Realschule or Gymnasium."

"The most sanguine may be well content if the same progress shall be observed in modern language study in America during the coming ten years as has occurred during the past decade."

This paper, it should be observed, was written in February, 1887.

W. Vietor comments on the oldest German-English and English-German Grammar, bearing the imprint of London, 1687, and written by a certain H. Offelen, J. U. D.

English Imitations of Ancient Carmina Figurata is the title of a short notice by Karl Lentzner, in which two such, representing an egg and a Pan's-pipe, are introduced. The author suspects that other examples might be found in English poetry of the seventeenth century, as is undoubtedly the case.

III.—Emil Koeppel, in The Fragments of Barbour's Trojan War, proves that its author cannot have been the John Barbour who wrote The Bruce.

R. Boyle, Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger (concluded). After abundant citations in support of his views, Boyle summarizes as a part of his conclusions:

"1. Massinger's metre, in his known productions, coincides remarkably in its structure with the parts assigned to him in B. and F.'s dramas.

2. This coincidence of metre is accompanied by a similarity between the characterization in the former and the latter (in so far as the Massinger types have not been changed by his fellow-dramatist).

3. Massinger's characters are conventional like those of Italian comedy to a great extent, and occur, as may therefore be expected, over and over again in subsequent dramas.

4. These conventional characters employ in similar situations, similar expressions, also of a conventional kind, so often that the burden of proof must be regarded as the business of those who refuse to see Massinger's hand in them. (There are 1000 such passages given in these last four papers)."

Otto Jespersen, The New Language Teaching.

Among the Book Notices is an interesting one on Schaible's History of the Germans in England, in which we incidentally learn that "the first German grammar for the use of Englishmen is Martin Aedler's (publ. in 1680)." Körtling's Encyclopaedia and Methodology of Romance Philology is also reviewed.

XI Band, 1888.

I.—F. Krause, Minor Publications from the Auchinleck MS. This instalment, which is Part IX of the series, consists of an edition of The King of Tars, the Auchinleck and Vernon MSS being printed in parallel columns, with the variants of Additional MS 22283 of the British Museum at the foot of the second column. The text is preceded by dissertations on the manuscripts, prosody and style, dialect of the poem, dialect of the MSS, and contents and source of the poem.

Arthur Napier, Old English Glosses, communicates a short Latin-English Glossary, written in a hand of the beginning of the twelfth century on the margins of a metrical life of St. Swithun, in MS 7. 2. 14 of the Bodleian Library. Interesting or unique words are *crypte*, pret. of the verb *cryppan*, *hwicce*, *batt*, *purs*, *blasfordlic*, *tizelstan*, *sunderanweald*, *brydboda*, *rifelede*, meaning

respectively *cut* or *pierce*, *hutch*, *bat*, *purse*, *lordly*, *tile*, *monarchy*, *paranymph*, and *rivelled*.

M. Krummacker, *Language and Style in Carlyle's Frederick II.* A continuation of the same author's *Notes on the Language of Carlyle*, which was favorably noticed in Vol. VI, p. 514 of this Journal. The present study, of which the first instalment is here given, is to consist of a lexical, a grammatical, and a stylistic part, with special emphasis on Carlyle's colloquialisms.

G. Wendt, *Ireland in the Nineteenth Century.*

Among the more important works reviewed in the Book Notices may be mentioned Kington Oliphant's *The New English*, sharply criticised by A. L. Mayhew; Brandl's *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*; the second edition of Sievers' *Old English Grammar*; Cosijn's *Old West Saxon Grammar*; and Landmann's edition of the *Euphuës*.

The Miscellanea has an article by F. Lindner on *The English Translation of the Roman de la Rose*, and obituary notices of Dr. John Small and Dr. August Rhode, the former containing a list of Dr. Small's works.

II.—K. Elze, *Notes on Othello.*

M. Kaluza, *On the Relation of the Manuscripts and the Textual Criticism of the Cursor Mundi.* A supplement, as the author states, to Hupe's *Genealogie und Ueberlieferung der Handschriften des Mittellenglischen Gedichtes Cursor Mundi*. Incidentally the author expresses his opinion that Haenisch's *Inquiry into the Sources of the Cursor Mundi*, a Breslau dissertation of 1884, is the indispensable basis of all future inquiry in that direction.

H. Klinghardt, *The Character of the Australian People.*

The Book Notices include reviews of Körting's *Outline of the History of English Literature*, the second edition of Körner's *Introduction to the Study of Old English*, Sweet's *Second Middle English Primer*, Wright's *Bible Word-Book*, Sweet's *Elements of Spoken English*, and Vietor's *Phonetic Studies*, the latter a new periodical devoted to that subject.

The Miscellanea has an exhaustive obituary notice of Alexander Schmidt, the author of the *Shakespeare Lexicon*.

III.—Julius Zupitza, *Cantus Beati Godrici.* Stevenson edited the *Libellus de Vita et Miraculis Sancti Godrici* for the Surtees Society in 1845, at least nominally, for the book was not published till 1847. Zupitza here summarizes what is known about the saint, gives an account of the various manuscript versions of the short poems that he composed, and a critical text of each of the three. The results are set forth with great clearness, and constitute a welcome addition to our somewhat scanty stock of twelfth century literature. Strictly speaking, only two of the poems are presented in a critical text, since the third exists, so far as is known, in but a single manuscript. The three, as edited by Zupitza, are as follows:

- I. Sainte Marie uirgine,
moder Iesu Cristes Nazarene,
onfo, scild, help þin Godric,
onfang, bring hehlic wið þe in godes ric.

Sainte Marie, Cristes bur,
 maidenen clenhad, moderes flur,
 dilie mine sinne, rixe in min mod,
 bring me to winne wið self god.

II. Crist and sainte Marie
 swa on scamel me i ledde,
 at ic on this erðe
 ne silde wið mine bare fote itredie.

III. Sainte Nicholaes, godes druð,
 tymbre us faire scone hus,
 at þi burth, at þi bare;
 sainte Nicholaes, bring vs wel pare.

There are four French words, *sainte*, *virgine*, *flur*, *druð*, and one which is perhaps Scandinavian, *scone*. The dialect of the verses is unmistakably Northern.

M. Krummacher, Language and Style in Carlyle's Frederick II. The second instalment, devoted to grammatical notes.

W. Swoboda, The Sixth Congress of the National Society of French Professors in England.

The Miscellanea includes, among other matter, Notes on Chaucer's Sir Thopas, by Kölbing, and on English Etymologies, by Kluge.

ALBERT S. COOK.

HERMES, 1889.

I.

M. Rothstein, Properz und Vergil. R. discusses in detail the theme and scope of Prop. El. III 32, (34): Cur quisquam faciem dominae iam credit amico?, and particularly the allusions to Vergil's productions and to other literary men of the day, with whom the author ranked himself and his reputation. Further on R. cites parallels from the two poets, i. e. reminiscences in Propertius from passages or phrases in Eclogues and Georgics. The lines III 10, 25 sq.

Nondum enim Ascræos norunt mea carmina fontes
 sed modo Permessi flumine lavit amor,

are interpreted in detail, the Permessus river being taken as typifying elegy-writing. R. derives this from Verg. Ecl. 6, 64 sqq. The difficult and curious phrase *amor timetur*, I 11, 7 (Lachmann changed to *veretur*), is illustrated and defended by a reference to Verg. Ecl. 3, 109-10: et quisquis *amores* aut *metuet dulcis* aut *experietur amarus*,—a passage of at least equal difficulty. R. suggests taking *metuere amores* as a kind of accus. of the inner object 'entertain anxious love' [comp. "Freudvoll und leidvoll, etc." E. G. S.]. On the other hand R. believes that a few phrases in the Aeneid were due to reminiscences of Propertius, e. g. II 2, 6: et incedit vel Iove digna soror. Cf. Aen. I 46: ast ego quae divom incedo regina Iovisque et soror et coniunx. These and other parallels have been gathered by Reinsch, Wiener Studien, IX, p. 122.

G. Kaibel, Zur Attischen Komödie. 1. Notes on the comic poet Phrynichus, a contemporary of Aristophanes; v. Schol. on Ran. 13; Av. 750. K.

interprets a fragm. of the *Τραγῳδοὶ ἡ Ἀπελεύθεροι* of Phrynichus (Athen. IV 165b), evidently an allusion to the practice of criticising and sermonizing in the *parabasis*, the most original and characteristic element of old comedy. Next an attempt is made to reconstruct the general theme of Phrynichus's Ephialtes. 2. Archippus and the criticism of the Pergamenian scholars. How are we to explain that some titles of plays are assigned to A. or B.? The critics, finding from internal evidence that the name of an author prefixed in MSS could not belong to the particular play, suggested another, and thus the two names of authors passed into tradition, as is the case with the *Ποίησις*, *Νῆσοι*, *Ναυαγός* and *Νίοβος*, in the biographies of Aristophanes. Why did the ancient critics suggest Archippus as the real author of these four plays? Arch. flourished about 100 B. C.; his *Ἰχθύες* probably imitated the *Birds* of Aristophanes in its economy, a point which Kaibel elaborates with a full array of literary and dramatic data, and this suggested to the ancient critics the idea that these four plays in the Aristophanic corpus might well be assigned to Archippus. That these critics were Pergamenians and not Alexandrians may be gathered from the note in Pollux 9, 89, where the plural *ἀργύρια* for the regular Attic *ἀργύριον* is cited from the *Νῆσοι*; for it is precisely in such points of style that the Pergamenians showed their peculiar strength. Here Kaibel takes occasion to show that the Pergamenians went their own way in their study of Attic comedy as in everything. The Alexandrians divided comedy into old, middle and new; the Pergamenians, caring only for the style, into older and younger. So Dionysios in his tract *περὶ μιμήσεως*; cf. Quint. X 1, 66, and Plutarch, *Moral.* 712ab. Hence Menander is held up by Dionys. H. as a study for the future orator, and in like manner Plutarch extols Menander above the old masters. Evidently then, according to Kaibel, there was no scope for the middle comedy, which had to do with types, not with characters. Applying this to the treatise *περὶ κωμῳδίας* (Vesp. Dübner), we are now able to understand it better. It is the work of a Byzantine writer who really recognizes only two comedies, an old and a new, and bases the division on the style—on the purity of language in the new as compared with the ambitious, lofty and bizarre diction of the old, though the old comedy itself had passed through important changes under the influence of the rhetorical school of Gorgias. This paper of Kaibel's is an excellent specimen of constructive criticism, one of the most valuable productions printed in the *Hermes* within the last ten years.

F. Leo, *Varro und die Satire*. Horace, *Sat.* I 4, in making Lucilius an imitator of old Attic comedy follows Varro; cf. Diomedes, *περὶ ποιημάτων*, p. 485, and Festus, p. 314, both statements being traced to Varro. Varro in turn followed, in his conception of literary history, the analogies of Greek studies, particularly the Aristotelian and the Alexandrian schools.

U. Köhler, *Beitraege zur Geschichte der Pentekontaetie*: Thucydides's account supplemented with epigraphic material. What of C. I. Att. I 432? The lists of slain there given were referred by Kirchhoff to the defeat at Drabescus, Thuc. I 100, 3; cf. Paus. I 29, 4. Köhler controverts the correctness of this historical reference, basing his arguments largely on Plutarch, *Cimon* 14. Cimon conducted operations in the northern and Hellespontian region, in the course of which the soldiers mentioned in the inscription may have fallen. Köhler suggests *ἐπὶ Σιγείῳ* for *ἐπὶ Σιδείῳ*: "die Buchstabenzeichen

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099 1100 1101 1102 1103 1104 1105 1106 1107 1108 1109 1110 1111 1112 1113 1114 1115 1116 1117 1118 1119 1120 1121 1122 1123 1124 1125 1126 1127 1128 1129 1130 1131 1132 1133 1134 1135 1136 1137 1138 1139 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1150 1151 1152 1153 1154 1155 1156 1157 1158 1159 1160 1161 1162 1163 1164 1165 1166 1167 1168 1169 1170 1171 1172 1173 1174 1175 1176 1177 1178 1179 1180 1181 1182 1183 1184 1185 1186 1187 1188 1189 1190 1191 1192 1193 1194 1195 1196 1197 1198 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213 1214 1215 1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229 1230 1231 1232 1233 1234 1235 1236 1237 1238 1239 1240 1241 1242 1243 1244 1245 1246 1247 1248 1249 1250 1251 1252 1253 1254 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260 1261 1262 1263 1264 1265 1266 1267 1268 1269 1270 1271 1272 1273 1274 1275 1276 1277 1278 1279 1280 1281 1282 1283 1284 1285 1286 1287 1288 1289 1290 1291 1292 1293 1294 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1300 1301 1302 1303 1304 1305 1306 1307 1308 1309 1310 1311 1312 1313 1314 1315 1316 1317 1318 1319 1320 1321 1322 1323 1324 1325 1326 1327 1328 1329 1330 1331 1332 1333 1334 1335 1336 1337 1338 1339 1340 1341 1342 1343 1344 1345 1346 1347 1348 1349 1350 1351 1352 1353 1354 1355 1356 1357 1358 1359 1360 1361 1362 1363 1364 1365 1366 1367 1368 1369 1370 1371 1372 1373 1374 1375 1376 1377 1378 1379 1380 1381 1382 1383 1384 1385 1386 1387 1388 1389 1390 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1399 1400 1401 1402 1403 1404 1405 1406 1407 1408 1409 1410 1411 1412 1413 1414 1415 1416 1417 1418 1419 1420 1421 1422 1423 1424 1425 1426 1427 1428 1429 1430 1431 1432 1433 1434 1435 1436 1437 1438 1439 1440 1441 1442 1443 1444 1445 1446 1447 1448 1449 1450 1451 1452 1453 1454 1455 1456 1457 1458 1459 1460 1461 1462 1463 1464 1465 1466 1467 1468 1469 1470 1471 1472 1473 1474 1475 1476 1477 1478 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1490 1491 1492 1493 1494 1495 1496 1497 1498 1499 1500 1501 1502 1503 1504 1505 1506 1507 1508 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1516 1517 1518 1519 1520 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1527 1528 1529 1530 1531 1532 1533 1534 1535 1536 1537 1538 1539 1540 1541 1542 1543 1544 1545 1546 1547 1548 1549 1550 1551 1552 1553 1554 1555 1556 1557 1558 1559 1560 1561 1562 1563 1564 1565 1566 1567 1568 1569 1570 1571 1572 1573 1574 1575 1576 1577 1578 1579 1580 1581 1582 1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1589 1590 1591 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1599 1600 1601 1602 1603 1604 1605 1606 1607 1608 1609 1610 1611 1612 1613 1614 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1620 1621 1622 1623 1624 1625 1626 1627 1628 1629 1630 1631 1632 1633 1634 1635 1636 1637 1638 1639 1640 1641 1642 1643 1644 1645 1646 1647 1648 1649 1650 1651 1652 1653 1654 1655 1656 1657 1658 1659 1660 1661 1662 1663 1664 1665 1666 1667 1668 1669 1670 1671 1672 1673 1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1730 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1740 1741 1742 1743 1744 1745 1746 1747 1748 1749 1750 1751 1752 1753 1754 1755 1756 1757 1758 1759 1760 1761 1762 1763 1764 1765 1766 1767 1768 1769 1770 1771 1772 1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1778 1779 1780 1781 1782 1783 1784 1785 1786 1787 1788 1789 1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795 1796 1797 1798 1799 1800 1801 1802 1803 1804 1805 1806 1807 1808 1809 1810 1811 1812 1813 1814 1815 1816 1817 1818 1819 1820 1821 1822 1823 1824 1825 1826 1827 1828 1829 1830 1831 1832 1833 1834 1835 1836 1837 1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1847 1848 1849 1850 1851 1852 1853 1854 1855 1856 1857 1858 1859 1860 1861 1862 1863 1864 1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875 1876 1877 1878 1879 1880 1881 1882 1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1890 1891 1892 1893 1894 1895 1896 1897 1898 1899 1900 1901 1902 1903 1904 1905 1906 1907 1908 1909 1910 1911 1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 1925 1926 1927 1928 1929 1930 1931 1932 1933 1934 1935 1936 1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1943 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2

ΑΑΔ sind auch in den öffentlichen Inschriften Athens, namentlich in Eigennamen, nicht selten unter einander vertauscht worden." 2. Political history derived or traced from sepulchral inscriptions. In regard to what is now C. I. Att. II 1675, Visconti had assigned it to the end of the Theban era, Kaibel to a year of the Corinthian war (394 B. C.); Köhler suggests the military operations of Pericles before the thirty years truce of 446 B. C., when the peculiar situation of circumstances made it obligatory for an Attic corps in retiring from the Megarid to make a détour through the Boeotian frontier and so regain Attica, Pleistoanax having occupied Eleusis with the Spartan invaders. The mention of Andokides (grandfather of orator) as *στρατηγός* is a considerable argument for Köhler's historical interpretation.

O. Hirschfeld, "Zu Römischen Schriftstellern." Critical notes on Cicero, Hirtius, Frontinus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Appuleius, *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, Martial, Juvenal.

A. Wilhelm, *Attische Psephismen*. Mostly post-Euclidean, and in the main either unpublished or not edited in a satisfactory manner. They are chiefly personal decrees of eulogy or bestow various rewards and gratifications upon meritorious foreigners and citizens. Neither detailed report nor summary is practicable. The Halicarnassian Apollonides, p. 123 sq., distinguished by the bestowal of Proxenia, is probably identical with the Apollonides mentioned by Demosthenes, *contra Lacritum*. The decree is of 354-53.

II.

A. Reuter, *Der Codex Bernensis 363 und sein Werth für die Kritik des (Rhetorikers) Chirius Fortunatianus*. MS of ninth century, written in the diocese of Milan, probably in the generation of the sons of Louis the Pious (†840 A. D.) The monk was "Scottigena" and the script is British.

Hülßen, *Die Abfassungszeit der Capitolinischen Fasten*. Hirschfeld suggested 742 A. U. C. (= 12 B. C.), in which year Augustus became pontifex m. Mommsen held, with Borghesi, that the list of magistrates was composed about 724 = 30 B. C. or 718 (24 B. C.), the list of triumphs in the year suggested by Hirschfeld. Hülßen maintains Mommsen's date, and the present paper is really an anticipation of or specimen of ed. II (of vol. I, C. I. L.) now in preparation.

Mommsen, *Das Römische Militärwesen seit Diocletian* (195-219 pp. Hermes). The general term for the corps or body of troops is *numerus*, ἀριθμός; κατάλογος in Procopius. After the time of Constantine I. there is a distinction between the emperor's troops, *milites palatini* or *comitatenses*, and the frontier soldiers, *milites ripenses* or *riparienses* or *limitanei*, with rank and pay inferior to that of the others. The frontier troops consisted of 40 legions which, however, were broken up both as to their camps and in the command, six tribunes on an average commanding 1000 troops each. Indirectly the frontiers were guarded by the adjacent states and tribes allied to Rome: Ethiopians south of Egypt, Saracens on the Euphrates, Goths on the Danube; to these in course of time payments were made, *annona foederatica*. The household troops or élite, called *scholae*, were probably an institution of Constantine I., the "emperor's own," men of distinguished physique and all mounted, arms and pay above

the ordinary, arranged in bodies of 500 men. The *palatini* or *comitatenses* were attached not to any capital but to the emperor directly, the cavalry in 61 vexillationes, the infantry in 69 "legions." These legions, however, were not bodies of the old numerical strength; their names point chiefly to Illyricum and Gaul. The command of infantry and cavalry is distinct. The *bucellarii* ("biscuit-eaters") were men hired by private persons or condottieri; they were mounted men. This mode of self-help shows the political decay of the state. After the Diocletian era the barbarians are preferred as soldiers; next in desirability are the least civilized of the provincials, and so on. Slaves were enrolled after 400; of course they were enfranchised then. The total number of troops as calculated by Mommsen from the *Notitia dignitatum* was 554,500 men, of which 360,000 were frontier troops and 194,500 were imperial or *palatini*, these being figures of normal strength. A writer of Justinian's time (527-560) says that the empire required 645,000 troops, but the emperor had but 150,000. Mommsen's enumeration of forces, pp. 274-279, might serve admirably as an introduction to the history of the Middle Ages.

F. Leo, *Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Alterthums*. The *older* is that metrical system which reduces all metres to two primary types: the epic hexameter and the iambic hexameter. The younger is Alexandrian, the system of Hephaestis, Pacatus, Philoxenus (10 *πρωτότυπα*). Whence came Varro's metrical theories (as reproduced in Caesius Bassus)? Possibly the Pergamenian school first developed the simple mode of analysis (p. 295) in opposition to the Alexandrian system. The latter was substantially completed by 150 A. D.; the oldest representatives extant of that system in our tradition being of the era of the Antonines. *Some* Alexandrian doctrine, it is true, is found in Caesius Bassus, the representative of Varronian theory. Leo prints parallel extracts on p. 298.

H. Diels, *Reiskii animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem*. From John Jacob Reiske, a man of the most eminent genius, the apathy of the Germans, as Diels puts it, and the jealousy of the Dutch withheld due recognition in his lifetime ("Germanorum torpor et livor Batavorum coniuraverunt in divinum illud ingenium"). The MS of R. *Animadversiones* (the publication began in 1757, 5 vols.) passed into Lessing's hands, and subsequently found a permanent abode in the royal library of Copenhagen. Diels, engaged in working up Diogenes, obtained a loan of the MS. Diels praises R. in the strongest terms, ascribing to him the virtues of the critic in almost unparalleled perfection. Besides, as to the necessary basis of criticism: Graeci sermonis tam gnarus fuit ut paucos eum aequare, superare neminem existimem. [The reporter often heard M. Haupt speak in similar terms of Reiske.] A large number of extracts from Reiske's emendation of Diogenes are given with recent suggestions also by Diels.

Wilhelm, *Attische Psephismen*, II; cf. p. 108. Several decrees contain the provision that the meritorious foreigner eulogized should have the privilege of acquiring house and land in Athens (*ἐγκτήσις*); a long inscription, pp. 331-32, specifies this privilege: a house within 3000 drachmas, land up to two talents.

E. G. SIHLER.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. XLIV.

Pp. 320-330. F. Bücheler attempts the reading and explanation of five Oscan inscriptions found at different times at Capua. The alphabet used is the later Oscan with some slight changes. In the first occurs the word *pompeđias*, Latin *pomperias*, which is the Oscan name of a fraternity corresponding to the *decuriae* of a Roman *collegium sacerdotum*. With this *pomperia*, meaning a fraternity consisting of five, B. connects the name (Numa) *Pompilius*. The adjective *namerttia*, occurring in the same inscription, is a derivative of the well known Oscan name for Mars, preserved in the gens *Mamertina*. In the third inscription we meet for the first time the name of the gens *Magia* of Capua (cf. Liv. 23, 7, *Decius Magius Capuensis*). *Idus*, Oscan *eidus*, cannot be connected with Greek *αἶθερ*, Latin *aedes*; its etymology is obscure. The ending *-us* in *idus* has a temporal signification.

Pp. 331-346, 488. A. Riese believes, with Pliny, Hist. Nat. IV 100, that the Suevi were a part of the *Hermiones*, a close confederacy of a few tribes dwelling in the interior of Germany on either side of the river *Albis*. The *Semnones*, the *Langobardi*, etc., perhaps even the western *Hermunduri*, belonged to this confederacy, which in later times moved further to the south-west and disappeared in the general name *Allemanni*. The Suevi in Caesar occupied the eastern banks of the Rhine in and about the country now called *Baden*, while Tacitus speaks of them as living to the north-east of the Suevi of Caesar. Strabo's account that τὸ μέγιστον ἔθνος, the Suevi reached ἀπὸ τοῦ Ῥήνου μέχρι τοῦ Ἀλβίου (VII 290) is but a reminiscence from Caesar, and contradicted by himself in other parts of his work. From the time of Augustus the Suevi and *Marcomanni* were united, and Strabo considers them as one nation, wherein he is followed by Tacitus. The latter's enumeration of the tribes of the Suevi (Germ. 38-45) is contradicted by his own statement in the *Annales*, and by that of other historians. In the *Germania* Tacitus simply copied the account of an author describing the Suevian empire during the period of its greatest extent at the time of King *Marbod*, and makes the additional mistake of confounding the tribes subject to the rule of the Suevi with the Suevi themselves. *Marbod's* vainglory and the boasting of his Roman protectors may partly account for the mistakes of Tacitus.

Pp. 347-386. P. Cauer emphasizes the great importance of a careful punctuation of the Homeric text. Editors have simply followed I. Bekker, who is not very reliable. (1) The omission of unnecessary commas, etc., will help towards a better understanding of passages like A 193 ff., B 577-80, E 487-9, β 199-201, β 2-6, A 199 f., M 378-85, A 140 ff., and M 416 f. (2) He next examines instances in which two neighboring signs of punctuation are confusing, because it has to be decided whether the words between these marks belong to the preceding or the following; such is the case in B 8 ff., Z 150 f., B 318 ff., I 334-341. (3) On such a decision depends at times the correct understanding of a whole period, as e. g. M 269-274, Z 146 ff., B 703 ff., ν 131 ff., B 870 ff., 641 ff. (4) Wolf introduced the signs of exclamation and interrogation; they were omitted by Spitzner and Bekker. Cauer strongly advocates the reintroduction of them into the text, as it would facilitate the interpretation of ρ 483 f., T 428, π 23, Δ 81, Δ 818, Z 257, X 8 ff., B 193-7 and 248-257.

Pp. 369-373. C. Frick, in a note on J. J. Scaliger, and the chronicle of Victor Tunnunensis, and that of his continuer Joannes abbas monasterii Biclarensis, shows that Scaliger made use, for his edition of the *Thesaurus temporum* complectens Eusebii Pamphili chronicum, of a MS of the Jesuit father Andreas Schott, of Toledo, sent to him by Marcus Welser. This is proved by the agreement of the two MSS, that of Schott and the Cod. Scal. 25. The 'Thesaurus temporum,' by the way, is a supplement to Scaliger's celebrated work 'De emendatione temporum,' Paris, 1583, which has been the basis of all later works on ancient chronology.

Pp. 374-396. Ivo Bruns continues his studies in Lucian. A careful analysis of *Zeὺς τραγωδός* and *Z. ἐλεγχόμενος* shows that Lucian does not wage war against the popular belief of the Greeks concerning their gods, but rather against the teaching of the Stoics. His model for the *Zeὺς ἐλεγχόμενος* must have been a treatise written by a Cynic philosopher against mantic art and fate, perhaps even the *γοήτων φώρα* of Oenomaus, which quoted approvingly the teachings of the Epicureans *passim*. Beautiful scenery, lively action, and rich satire are the characteristic features of the *Zeὺς τραγωδός*. In this tract also, Lucian, in the person of the Pseudo-Epicurean Damis, combats the Stoic theology represented by Timocles. The two satires show that the author sympathized with the doctrines of the Cynics and the Epicureans without identifying himself with either.

Pp. 397-405. Joh. Schmidt maintains against Mommsen (*Herm.* XX 144 ff., A. J. P. VII 251) that East-Zama, not West-Zama, is identical with the Zama regia of Sall. Jug. 56, and that the easterly Zama was also the scene of Scipio's victory over Hannibal in 202 B. C.

Pp. 431-440. O. Rossbach examines several Cretan coins from Gortyna and Phaestus, and the legends connected therewith. The silver coins of Gortyna represent a young maiden sitting in the midst of a tree, fondling with her hand an eagle; that of Phaestus shows a youth in the same position with a cock on his right knee. On the reverse is the picture of a bull; cf. Poole-Wroth, 'Catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum, Crete, pl. IX 9, 10; X 1-5; XV 10 and 12,' and Gardner, 'Types of Greek coins,' pl. IX 17-20. On the Gortynian coins we probably have a representation of Europa carried away by Zeus in the form of an eagle and let down in the top of a sacred plane-tree. The Phaestus coin refers to Ganymede, the *παῖς καλός* of Olympus.

Pp. 440-447. C. Cichorius. The Greek inscription of 18 lines, published by Conze in his 'Reise auf der Insel Lesbos,' pl. XI 3, is a treaty of alliance between Rome and Methymna, dating about the middle of the sixth century a. u. c. The text is printed, restored, and interpreted. With the help of this inscription the one containing the *senatus consultum* concerning Astypalaia (649 a. u. c.) is restored and explained.

Pp. 448-460. O. Crusius explains: (1) Lucil. ap. Non. 201, XVI 8, p. 70. (2) Catullus 68a, ll. 15-20, where *curis* in *non est dea nescia nostri* | *quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem* means *carmina curiose elaborata*. (3) In Aristaenetus Ep. 11, p. 143 we are told of one who *ἐδόκει τῇ κεφαλῇ ψάβειν τοῦ*

οὐρανοῦ. This was turned εἰς τὸ γελοιότερον by a Greek comic poet, who substituted ἀράττειν for ψάτειν, and read οὕτως ἀράσσει τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν οὐρανόν (see Kock, C. A. F. III, p. 505, fr. 531). This is the original of the last line of Hor. Od. I 1, sublimi feriam sidera vertice. (4) Hor. Epod. IV, quid attinet tot ornavium gravi | rostrata duci pondere is an imitation of the Greek φιᾶλης πρόσωπον and πρόσωπον νεῶς. (5) The treatment of the boy mentioned in Hor. Epod. V 29-35 seems to have been an old custom among magicians, to judge from the words of Proclus in Theolog. IV 9, p. 293, τοὺς θεουργοὺς θάπτειν τὸ σῶμα κελεύειν πλὴν τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐν τῇ μυστικωτάτῃ τῶν τελετῶν. (6) The lupi contrasted with the innerentes hospites in Hor. Epod. VI 1 ff. are bad, unscrupulous people. Nos. 7-11 treat of passages in Ovid's Metamorphoses. Ovid has also drawn from Greek sources, but often misunderstood the original, which was not the case with Horace. Nos. 12-17 discuss passages from Martial. In No. 18 Crusius proves that Apuleius also collected proverbs, and in No. 19 he discovers a new Latin poet, Pitholaus, mentioned by Macrobius II 2, 14.

Pp. 461-467. G. Hirschfeld publishes additional remarks on the inscriptions from Naucratis (A. J. P. X 244); he speaks of the origin of the Ionic alphabet and the date of the founding of the city. ζ and Σ were originally two distinct consonants; ζ goes back to Çādê, Σ to Shln. Çādê and Shln served to represent the same s-sound in Greek, at first indifferently; later some Greeks preferred ζ, others Σ. The inscriptions of Abu Simbel belong to the Çādê-group, those of Miletus and Naucratis to the Shln-group. Zäyin became ζ and Sāmech ξ. What is usually called the Ionic alphabet was originally used only in Miletus. From the sixth century B. C. on it became the common character of Ionia. No epigraphical objections can be raised against the view that the Greeks were in Naucratis as early as the seventh century B. C.

Pp. 468-488. A. Ludwich reads, l. 398 of the Hom. Hymn to Hermes, ἐς Πύλον ἡμαθόεντ' ἰδ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειοῦ πόρον ἱζον, and l. 400, ἦχ' ᾤδην τὰ χρήματ' ἀτάλλετο νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ.—Comparing Eur. Ion. 401 and Crest. 1395, E. Graf thinks that the ἀρχά of Terpander (fr. I, Bergk) simply means ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, and has nothing to do with the technical term ἀρχά; that this fragment has no connexion with the νόμος of Terpander; cf. also p. 561 ff.—M. Schanz reads Soph. Phil. 758, εἰκει γὰρ αὐτῇ διὰ χρόνον νόσος, πλάνων and Bährens Paneg. lat. 247, c. IV, ingenuis indigni cruciatus corporibus, instead of ingenua indignis cruciatibus corpora.—H. L. Ulrichs has a note on the statue of Thrasymedus in the temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus, Paus. II 27, 2, and defends on p. 487 f. the traditional reading of Pliny, Hist. Nat. XXXVI 13.—L. Traube. The exempla diversorum auctorum in the Anthologia Latina compiled by Mico about 825 A. D. mention Sophocles as one of the contributors to this anthology.—Joh. Schmidt prints three African inscriptions: (1) Lex dedicationis simulacri Dianae Augustae; it is the fourth of its kind known to us. (2) An inscription found on the statue of a high officer under the Flavian Emperors, stationed at Carthage; it is probably that of Sex. Vettulenus Cerealis, mentioned by Flav. Jos. bell. Iud. VI 4, 3. (3) Epitaph of a charioteer at Theveste. Additional remarks and corrections are found in Vol. XLV 157-9.

Pp. 489-509. K. Buresch. Triopeion, Herodes, Regilla. Herodes Atticus lived between 102-178 A. D.; his wife Regilla seems to have died before the end of the sixties. The Triopeion was built by Herodes at the Via Appia, near Rome, soon after the death of the younger Faustina, the wife of Marcus Aurelius (175 A. D.), and was dedicated to the honor of the older Faustina as Demeter and the younger as Proserpina. This conclusion is based on the interpretation of several passages of the dedicatory inscription CIG. III 6280. Against this No. 6185 of the same volume seems to militate, but that is shown to be a modern forgery. Of the inscription CIG. III 6184 the part referring to Regilla is a forgery, but not that mentioning **Maxentius**.

Pp. 510-521. H. van Herwerden contributes twelve pages of emendations to Iliad and Odyssey.

Pp. 522-531. M. Ihm has four observationes in patres ecclesiasticos latinos: (1) Maximus Taurinensis (d. 25 July 466 A. D.) left chiefly homilies; he frequently quotes Cicero and Vergil; several passages are emended. (2) The Benedictine edition of the works of St. Ambrose contains a number of wrong readings. A passage in his Epistolae 67, 5 is but a translation of Philo's *περὶ φυλάδων*. On the basis of this Ihm emends accordingly. (3) Paulinus, Archbishop of Nola (d. 431 A. D.), has a number of reminiscences from Vergil and other Latin poets. (4) Marius Mercator (about 430 A. D.) wrote against the Pelagians.

Pp. 532-540. According to Fr. Vogel, Diodorus, in the account of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, made use of Ephorus only for XII 39-40 of his work, not for c. 38, as has been believed hitherto; c. 38 differs in tone and character from cc. 39 and 40, and cannot have been composed by one and the same writer. The two chapters agree with the account of Thucydides, and acquit Ephorus of the charge of narrowness.

Pp. 540-552. M. Manitius sends eight paragraphs on late Latin poets. (1) He agrees with F. Vogel (Vol. XLI 158; A. J. P. X 239) that the lyric poet Maximianus lived towards the end of the Gothic empire, and asserts that the poet was a Christian, not a Pagan. (2) The introduction to the Cynegetica of Nemesianus contains a quotation from Valer. Flaccus V 76. (3) Priscian translated the *περιήγησις οἰκουμένης* of Dionysius with a number of additions. He borrowed largely from Solinus, Pliny, Vergil, and Lucan. The De laude Anastasii also contains quotations from Vergil and Venantius Fortunatus. (4) Jovinus. (5) Chilpericus Rex, imitator of Sedulius. (6) Venantius Fortunatus. (7) Notes on the poems of Eugenius of Toledo, seventh century, which do not deserve the harsh criticism of Ebert (Geschichte d. christl. Lit. I 569 f.) (8) The centos of Columbanus.

Pp. 553-567. O. Immisch. On the history of Greek lyric poetry. (1) Agreeing with E. Hiller, who has proved that there are interpolations in the list of Pindar's works as found in Suidas (A. J. P. VIII 505), the writer believes that the 17 *δράματα τραγικά* denote the comprehensive characteristic of the whole lyric poetry of Pindar. The later free usage of the words *τραγωδία*, *κωμῳδία*, and *δρᾶμα* is examined. (2) *Ὄρδια* and *σκολιά* do not differ in their metrical form, but in their character, the one representing the more earnest side of the

convivial poetry, the other the more jovial. Terpander fr. 1 (Bergk) is a complete *σπονδεῖον*; the *σπονδεῖα* are called *δρῦα* from the erect position of the one that pours out the libation. The *σκολιόν* received the name from the broken, zigzag order observed by the singers in the *συμπόσιον*; it is equal to the *παράβολα*, an after-dinner speech or song (Hom. Hymn to Hermes 56).

Pp. 568-574. E. Pernice. Ad metrologicorum scriptorum reliquias; he edits Diodori de ponderibus et mensuris expositio, and adds notes on the edition of Hultsch.

Pp. 575-612. J. Koch maintains against Jeep (preface to the edition of Claudian) that the panegyricus de tertio consulatu Honorii was composed by Claudian in Dec. 395, and the panegyricus de quarto cons. Hon. in the fall of 397 A. D. The two books in Rufinum were completed during the year 396, the preface to book II was written in the fall of 397; the epithalamium de nuptiis Honorii et Mariae precedes the bellum Gildonicum, which was completed in the spring of 398 A. D. Then follows a historical sketch of the events from the death of the Emperor Theodosius the Great to the end of the bellum Gildonicum (395-398 A. D.)

Pp. 613-630. Ivo Bruns. Studies in Alexander of Aphrodisias. The idea of the possible and the Stoa. Interpretation of and critical remarks on De fato 32, 16 (ed. Orelli) and Quaestiones I, 4 (ed. Spengel).

Pp. 631-640. J. Wackernagel proposes to read *οἷη* ('only') for *εἰ μὴ* in Hom. Hymn to Demeter, l. 24; l. 26 is a later interpolation—F. B. Corrections and additions to A. Hausrath's edition of the second book of Philodemus *περὶ ποιημάτων*, published in Fleckeisen's Supplementheft XVII, pp. 213-276.—Cicero, De fin. II 8, 23, quotes from a satire of Lucilius on the asoti qui in mensam vomant; the passage, as found in Cicero, is corrupt and K. Dziatzko proposes to read his omnibus exquisitis, vitantis eorum (i. e. asotorum) cruditatem, 'quibus vinum defusum e pleno sit *χρυσίζον*' (?), ut ait Lucilius, cui nildum situis [et] sacculus abstulerit. Lucilius probably wrote, defus(um) e pleno sit hrysizon quibus vinum | quoi nildum situis sacculus abstulerit. It is well known that Lucilius had used a great many Greek terms and phrases in his satires.—G. Gundermann. The via Gallica in the description of the 14 regiones is identical with the ager Pomptinus mentioned by Frontinus, Strategemata II 6, 1. It is not a continuation of the via Aurelia, but a branch road of the via Appia.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BRIEF MENTION.

STOCK's *pro Roscio* (Clarendon Press, 1890) is valuable to the student who begins the more extended study of Cicero's orations, because it furnishes him, in addition to a really good commentary on Cicero's first public speech, an introduction which gives in compact shape much excellent material for beginning rhetorical studies. There has been a judicious sifting of material, and the student has in easily available form what would generally cost him much reading in Cornificius, Cicero and Quintilian to gather. In the text Baiter and Kayser have been followed. In the commentary a comparison with Donkin will show that the notes are fuller and often deal with things left untouched by the other. They are well chosen and will prove of great assistance to the student.

E. H. S.

In my notice of Ritter's *Untersuchungen über Plato* (X 480) I said: 'Counting is not denied to any one,' but added, 'even facts are not so easily caught as some fancy, and who that has taken out his grammatical butterfly net has not been exposed to disappointment and mortification?' Certainly not Ritter, if I may judge by the report of a student of mine, who has been counting after him, and who calls attention to the sad slip on p. 58, where the number of pages in Theaetetus is put down at 68, the number in Phaedrus at 101—exactly the reverse of the true state of things. In the *Laws* εἰς or κατὰ διῆκην is used, according to my informant, 66 times, and not as R. says 63; ἐνεκα 123 times, and not 111; χάριν 38 times, and not 33. Much more startling is the following statement: ὥς is used at least forty-three times in the *Laws* instead of Ritter's four, and ῥάχα = ὥς occurs twenty times against Ritter's never. I have not been able to verify these charges as to the accuracy of R.'s statistics, but it seems incumbent on any one who works in this line to look more narrowly into R.'s figures than has been done, at least to my knowledge.

Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie or Defence of Poesy, as the title appears on the cover of Professor COOK's excellent edition (Boston, Ginn & Co.), is always delightful reading, especially for a classical scholar who feels the debt that our English prose writing owes the men who first felt the need of style and drew on the true sources of style. Sidney's English has to this day a wonderful charm, and the answer to the question why it is for all time, lies in the classic source of his inspiration. In his introduction Professor Cook draws an interesting parallel between the Greek sophists and the English euphuists, between Gorgias and Sidney; but there is no such excess of mannerism in Sidney as there is in Gorgias, or what purports to be Gorgias, and for this we have to thank Sidney's classic models, though these were predominantly Latin, as a matter of course. A first hand knowledge of the Greek authors whom Sidney cites is not made evident by the character of his references. The one or two Greek words are not absolutely conclusive. His allusions to Homer are vague.

Euripides' Hecuba (49, 34) may have been known to him in the translation of Erasmus, the Medea (17, 7) in the translation of Buchanan, the Ajax of Sophocles (6, 29) in the translation of Rotallerus, all which, by the way, are comprised in a little volume of *Tragoediae Selectae* printed by H. Stephanus in 1567. There is no display of recondite learning, which, indeed, would have spoiled the little treatise, and the only classical allusions that are not patent have to do with schoolbooks that have lost their vogue. Phocylides and Dares Phrygius are names that might not wake responsive images in all men of letters to-day, and in fact even Professor Cook has got hold of the wrong Phocylides. Sidney's Phocylides (3, 20; 9, 35) is not the real Phocylides, but the Pseudo-Phocylides, whose enormous reputation was due to the Jewish-Christian wisdom and morality injected by the pious forger. Amusing is the droll centaur 'Bubonax,' half-Bupalus, half-Hipponax, to which Professor Cook calls our attention. But is it a centaur or simply an Irish bull? By the way, in the same context Sidney says: 'I will not wish unto you—to be rimed to death as it is said to be done in Ireland.' Surely some note is expected here, at least a reference to Rosalind's words, 'I was never so berhymed since Protagoras' time, that I was an Irish rat.'

The slips of a less rigorous censor than Dr. W. GUNION RUTHERFORD is might be allowed to correct themselves in the course of time, but the Headmaster of Westminster School wields the 'tawse' of his native clime so unmercifully that one is tempted to point out sundry things in his *First Greek Grammar* (London and New York, Macmillan & Co.), the like of which he would not fail to visit in a German scholar *horribili flagello*. Let us hasten to say in advance that some necessary truths are stated by Dr. Rutherford with a masculine impressiveness that will do no harm, and that the false air of originality may be pardoned for the sake of the educational good. But Dr. Rutherford has not got *ὥστε* right, and though he might plead a matter of opinion there, he has not got *πρίν* right, and that is inexcusable. He puts *ὥς* final on the same plane with *ὅπως*, which is not tolerable on his own principles, and whatever a more indulgent Grecian might do, so formidable an Atticist should have thought of *εἶπεν* before *ἐλέξεν* in constructing a paradigm even if both are allowable; and *νομίζειν ὅτι* is too exceptional a construction (see A. J. P. IX 100) to be made a model for schoolboys. What right has he to maintain that *δοκεῖν* as 'think' is Ionic only without a word of qualification, without a hint that he counts the tragic poets as Ionic? *Ὅν* after *δυννυμι* is good enough for Babrius (50, 6), but no Atticist is justifiable in allowing it equal rights with *μή*, for the shift in Dem. 39, 4 is a shift from swearing to saying. Then, apart from positive mistakes, Mr. Rutherford's language is sometimes puzzling, sometimes misleading. Between two constructions, he says in one place 'there is only a difference of meaning.' In the name of philology what more does a grammarian want than a difference of meaning? And how unfortunate the statement that 'καλῶν when it is not itself negatived has *μή* before the following inf.' For 'has' read 'may have.' The rule is permissive, not mandatory. But it is not my purpose to dissect a Greek chap-book. Only errors are more dangerous in chap-books than elsewhere, especially when they are warranted by a deservedly distinguished scholar.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Century Dictionary (The). Prepared under the superintendence of W. Dwight Whitney. In 6 v. V. 3. New York, *The Century Co.*, 1890. Subs. \$15.

Craig (Ja. A.) Hebrew Word Manual, etymologically arranged. Cincinnati, *Rob. Clarke & Co.*, 1890. 120 pp., 12mo, cl. Net, \$1.

Demosthenes. Against Leptines; a revised text with an introduction, etc., by J. Edwin Sandys. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 98 + 121 pp., 8vo. cl., \$2.75. (Cambridge University Press.)

Euripides. The Alcestis; with introduction, notes, appendices, and a complete vocabulary by M. A. Bayfield. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 12 + 116 pp., 16mo, cl., 40 cts.

Laurie (S. S.) Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 8 + 147 pp., 12mo, cl., 90 cts.

Pausanias. Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens; being a translation of a portion of the "Attica" of Pausanias, by Margaret de G. Verrall; with an introductory essay and archaeological commentary, by Jane E. Harrison. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 156-635 pp., il., 12mo, \$4.50.

Rutherford (W. Gunion). First Greek Syntax. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 11 + 183 pp., 16mo, cl., 50 cts.

— First Greek Grammar: Accidence. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 24 + 183 pp., 16mo, cl., 90 cts.

ENGLISH.

Aeschylus. Agamemnon, Choephorae, and Eumenides. Rendered into English verse by John Dunning Cooper. Cr. 8vo, 186 pp. Wolverhampton, *Steen. Simpkin.* 6s.

Arbuthnot (F. F.) A Manual of Arabian History and Literature. 8vo, 256 pp. *Heinemann.* 10s.

Aristophanes. Clouds. By W. W. Merry. New ed. 12mo. *Clarendon Press.* 3s.

Caesar. Commentaries. The Gallic War, Books 6, 7 and 8. Ed. by Rev. Charles E. Moberly. 12mo. *Clarendon Press.* 3s. 6d.

Cicero pro Roscio. With introduction, text and notes by St. George Stock. 12mo. *Clarendon Press.* 3s. 6d.

Explanatory (The) Pronouncing Dictionary of Latin Quotations. 16mo, 96 pp. *J. Walker & Co.* 1s.

Fox (H. F.) and Bromley (Rev. T. M.) Models and Exercises in Unseen Translation. Extra fcap., viii-423 pp. *Clarendon Press.* 5s. 6d.

Harris (J. Rendel) and Gifford (Seth K.) The Acts of the Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas. Roy. 8vo, 66 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 5s.

Herodotus. V. Terpsichore. Ed. by E. S. Shuckburgh. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 276 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 3s.

Hessels (J. H.) An Eighth Century Latin Anglo-Saxon Glossary. 8vo, 260 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 10s.

Homer's Odyssey. Book 21. Ed. by G. M. Edwards. 12mo, 48 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s.

Models for Latin Prose Composition. Selected from the best authors. By J. Oliver. Cr. 8vo, sd., 240 pp. *Cambridge & Co.* 3s. 6d.

Plutarch's Lives of Galba and Otho. With introduction and explanatory notes by E. G. Hardy. (Classical Series.) 12mo, 394 pp. *Macmillan*. 6s.

Prudentius. Translations from Prudentius: a selection from his works rendered into English verse, with an introduction and notes, by Francis St. John Thackeray. 16mo, 296 pp. *Bell & Sons*. 7s. 6d.

Sabrinæ Corolla. New ed. 8vo, 484 pp. *Bell & Sons*. 10s. 6d.

Schrader (O.) Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples. Trans. by Frank Byron Jevons from the second German ed. 8vo, 496 pp. *Griffin*. 21s.

Stedman (A. M. M.) Greek Examination Papers in Miscellaneous Grammar and Idioms. Cr. 8vo, 126 pp. *Methuen*. 2s. 6d.

Virgil. Aeneid. Books 1-3. Edited, with introduction and notes, by T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh. (Clarendon Press Series.) Cr. 8vo, pp. 152. *Clarendon Press*. 3s.

Virgili Maronis Opera. With introduction and English notes by A. Sidgwick. (Pitt Press Series.) 2 vols. 12mo. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 8s.

Wharton (Edward Ross). Etyma Latina: an etymological lexicon of classical Latin. Cr. 8vo, 192 pp. *Rivingtons*. 7s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Basset (René). Loqmân berbère. Avec quatre glossaires et une étude sur la légende de Loqmân. In-12. *Leroux*. 10 fr.

Bergaigne (A.) et Henry (V.) Manuel pour étudier le sanscrit védique. Précis de grammaire. Chrestomathie. Lexique. Gr. in-8. *Bouillon*. 12 fr.

Berger (E.) Stylistique latine. Traduite de l'allemand par F. Gache et S. Piquet et remaniée par Max Bonnet et Ferdinand Gache. Nouvelle édition corrigée et augmentée. In-12. *C. Klincksieck*. Cart., 3 fr. 50.

Bonnet (Max). Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours. Gr. in-8. *Hachette*. 15 fr.

Codex Peresianus. Manuscrit hiératique des anciens Indiens de l'Amérique centrale, publié en fac-similé héliographique, avec une introduction et un glossaire par L. de Rosny. In-4. *Maisonneuve*. Cart., 150 fr.

Collection de reproductions de manuscrits publiée par L. Clédât. Classiques latins. I. Catulle, manuscrit de Saint-Germain-des-Prés (Bibl. nat., No. 14137), précédé d'une étude de M. Emile Chatelain. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

Darmesteter (James). Chants populaires des Afghans, recueillis, publiés et traduits. Gr. in-8. (Impr. nationale.) *Leroux*. 20 fr.

Dourisboure (P. X.) Dictionnaire bahnar-français. In-12. Hongkong, *Maisonneuve*. 7 fr. 50.

Hauréau (B.) Des poèmes latins attribués à saint Bernard. In-8. *C. Klincksieck*. 3 fr. 50.

Juvenalis Satira septima, texte latin publié avec un commentaire critique, explicatif et historique, par J. A. Hild. In-8. *C. Klincksieck*. 3 fr.

Quintilien. De Institutione oratoria. Liber primus. Texte latin, publié avec des notes biographiques et des notes critiques par Ch. Fierville. Gr. in-8. *F. Didot*. 10 fr.

Regnaud (Paul). Principes généraux de linguistique indo-européenne. In-12. *Hachette*. 2 fr.

Riemann (O.) Syntaxe latine d'après les principes de la grammaire historique. Nouvelle édition, entièrement remaniée. In-12. *C. Klincksieck*. Cart., 5 fr.

GERMAN.

Abel (L.) u. Winckler (H.) Keilschrifttexte, zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen hrsg. gr. Fol., iv, 100 S. Berlin, *Spemann*. m. 15.

Anthologiae Planudeae appendix Barberino-Vaticana. Rec. Leo Sternbach. gr. 8, xviii, 149 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.

Archiv f. lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik, hrsg. v. Ed. Wölfflin. 7. Jahrg., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. u. 2. Hft. 312 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 12.

Aristophanes, die Wespen. Übers. v. R. Lang. gr. 8, v, 141 S. Schaffhausen. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Athenaei Naucratisae dipnosophistarum libri XV, rec. Geo. Kaibel. Vol. III. Libri XI-XV et indices. 8, xii, 810 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 7.50 (cpl. m. 17.10).

Baumeister (A.) Bilderhefte aus dem griechischen u. römischen Altertum f. Schüler. 4-8 Hft. 4. München, *Oldenbourg*. à m. 1.25. Inhalt: 4. Herakles u. andere Mythen. S. 117-156. 1889.—5. Griechische Bildnisse u. Sitten. S. 157-196.—6. Römische Bildnisse u. Sitten. S. 197-236.—7, 8. Kunstentwicklung. I. II. S. 237-316. Cpl. n. 10; geb. 12.

Bethge (Rich.) De Septem adversus Thebas fabulae Aeschyleae episodico altero. gr. 4, 23 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Bibliographie, orientalische, unter Mitwirkg. v. A. Bezzenberger u. A. hrsg. v. Aug. Müller. IV. Bd., 1890. 8 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 32 S. Berlin, *Reuther*. Subscr.-Pr. m. 8.

Bibliotheca philologica classica. Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft. 17. Jahrg., 1890. 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 90 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 6.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 9. Bd. gr. 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 30. (I, 1-4. II, III, 1. IV-VI. u. IX., m. 314.) Inhalt: Die Achämenideninschriften zweiter Art. Hrsg. u. bearb. v. F. H. Weisbach. viii, 126 S. m. 16 autogr. Taf.)

Boetticher (Ernst). Hissarlik, wie es ist. Mit 14 Plänen u. 21 Abbildgn. 4, iii, 115 S. Berlin, *Trautwein*. m. 3.

Brugmann (Karl). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik. 2. Bd. Wortbildungslehre (Stammbildungs- u. Flexionslehre). 2. Hälfte. 1. Lfg. Zahlwortbildung. Casusbildung der Nomina (Nominaldeclination). Pronomina. gr. 8, S. 463-846. Strassburg i-E., *Trübner*. m. 10. (I-II. 2, 1. m. 36.)

Brugsch (Heinr.) Die Aegyptologie. 2. Abth. gr. 8, viii u. S. 241-535. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 14. (cplt. m. 24.)

— Religion u. Mythologie der alten Aegypter. Namen-Register. gr. 8, S. 759-772. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. —50. (cplt. m. Register, m. 16.50.)

Bruening (Adph.) De M. Iuniani Iustini codicibus. gr. 8, 54 S. Münster i-W. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Buettner-Wobst (Thdr.) Studia Byzantina. Part. I. gr. 4, 21 S. Dresden, v. *Zahn & Jaensch*. m. 1.20.

Bugge (Soph.) Etruskisch u. Armenisch. Sprachvergleichende Forschgn. I. Reihe. gr. 8, xviii, 171 S. Christiania, *Aschehoug & Co. in Comm.* m. 3.

Christaller (J. G.) u. Böhner (H.) Übungen in der Akra- od. Ga-Sprache. gr. 8, 103 S. Basel, *Missions-Buchhandlg.* geb. m. 2.

Commentationes Fleckeisenianae. gr. 8, vi, 300 S. m. Portr. in Lichtdr. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.

Commentationes philologicae Jenenses. Vol. IV. gr. 8, iv, 406 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 8. (cplt. m. 25.)

Corpus iuris Abessinorum. Textum aethiopicum arabicumque ed. Johs. Bachmann. Pars I. Ius connubii. gr. 4, xlii, 104 S. Berlin, *Schneider & Co.* m. 16.

Cuntz (Otto). Agrippa u. Augustus als Quellschriftsteller d. Plinius. [Aus, "Jahrb. f. class. Philol." 17. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8, S. 475-526 m. 2 farb. Karten. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.

Deecke (W.) Beiträge zur Auffassung der lateinischen Infinitiv-, Gerundial- u. Supinum-Konstruktionen. gr. 4, 50 S. Mülhausen i-E. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Demosthenes' Rede f. die Megalopoliten. Griechisch u. Deutsch, v. Wilh. Fox, S. J. gr. 8, xii, 205 S. Freiburg i-Br., *Herder*. m. 4.50.

Diener (Osw.) De sermone Thucydidis quatenus cum Herodoto congruens differat a scriptoribus atticis. Diss. gr. 8, 79 S. Leipzig, *Gräfe*, 1889. m. 1.20.

Dietze (Johs.) Quaestiones Hyginianae. Diss. gr. 8, 55 S. Kiel. Altona, *Lorenzen*. m. 1.50.

Dionis Cassii Cocceiani historia romana. Ed. primam curavit Ludw. Dindorf, recognovit Johs. Melber. Vol. I. 8, xlv, 604 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.50.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XI. gr. 8, iii, 402 S. Halle a-S., *Niemeyer*. m. 9. (I-XI, m. 87.)

Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. II. gr. 8, iii, 302 S. Wien u. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 8. (I u. II., m. 15.)

Du Cange, Carolus du Fresne, glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis. Anst. Neudr. in 10 Fasc. Fasc. I. Fol., xlii S. u. 176 Sp m. 1 Taf. Illustr. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 9.60.

Duhn (F. v.) u. Jacobi (L.) Der griechische Tempel in Pompeji. Mit 9 lith. Taf. u. 3 Photozinkogr. Fol., 37 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 10.

Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen u. vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft. 7. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 3. Inhalt: Die Jäby-Sprache der Finschhafener Gegend (N. O. Neu-Guinea; Kaiser Wilhelmsland) v. O. Schellong. Durchgesehen von H. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld. ii, 128 S.

Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen u. vergleichend. Sprachw. 8. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 2. (1-8, m. 60.) Inhalt: Zur Geschichte der Hieroglyphenschrift v. W. Pleyte. Nach dem Holl. v. Carl Abel. v, 48 S.

Elegiker, römische. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Propertius u. Ovid. Bearb. v. K. P. Schulze. 3. Aufl. gr. 8, xii, 288 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 2.40.

Engelmann (R.) Bilder-Atlas zu Ovid's Metamorphosen. 26 Taf. m. erläut. Texte. qu. Fol., iii, 13 S. Leipzig, *Verlag d. Litterar. Jahresberichts*. cart. m. 2.60; geb. m. 3.20.

Ephemeris epigraphica, edita iussu instituti archaeologici Romani cura Th. Mommseni, I. B. Rossii, O. Hirschfeldii. Vol. VII, Fasc. 3. gr. 8, S. 273-428. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 5. (1-3, m. 13.)

Escher (Jak.) Triton u. seine Bekämpfung durch Herakles. gr. 8, vi, 139 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.50.

Feige (Herm.) Die Geschichte d. Mär Abhdīšō u. seines Jüngers Mär Qardagh. Hrsg. u. übers. Lex.-8, 59 u. 104 S. Kiel, *Haeseler's Verl.* m. 6.

Ferber (Curtius). Utrum metuerit Tiberius Germanicum necne quaeritur. gr. 8, 50 S. Hamburg. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Festi (Sexti Pompei) de verborum significato quae supersunt. Ed. Aemilius Thewrewk de Ponor. Pars I. gr. 8, viii, 631 S. Budapesti, 1889. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 7.50.

Flierle (Jos.) Üb. Nachahmungen d. Demosthenes, Thucydides u. Xenophon in den Reden der römischen Archaeologie d. Dionysius v. Halicarnass. gr. 8, 85 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Fischer (Aug.) Biographien v. Gewährsmännern d. Ibn Ishāq. gr. 8, xviii, 116 S. Leiden, *Brill in Comm.* m. 4.

Florilegium graecum in usum primi gymnasiorum ordinis collectum a philologis Afranis. Fasc. VII et VIII. 8, 68 u. 66 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. cart. à m. —45.

Forcellini (Aegid.). Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera sive onomasticon totius latinitatis, opera et studio Vinc. De-Vit lucubratum. Distr. 36. gr. 4, 4. Bd. S. 401-480. Prati. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.* m. 2.50. (1-36, m. 89.)

Forchhammer (P. W.) Die Kyanen u. die Argonauten. Nebst 3 Anlagen: 1. Die Grotte auf Ithaka. 2. Dardanier. 3. Νεκτὸς ἀμολγῶ. gr. 8, 29 S. m. 1 Karte. Kiel, 1891, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.

Frese (Frz.) C. Valerius Catullus, e. biograph. Skizze. gr. 4, 20 S. Salzwedel. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Freund (Wilh.) Wanderungen auf klassischem Boden. Mit Ortsplänen u. Abbildgn. 3. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *Wohlfart*. à m. 1.

Fröhlich (Frz.) Das Kriegswesen Cäsars. 2. Tl. u. 3. Tl. I. gr. 8. Zürich, *Schulthess*. m. 1.40. (I-III, 1, m. 3.40.) Inhalt: Ausbildung u. Erhaltung der Kriegsmittel. Gebrauch u. Führ. der Kriegsmittel. I. S. 101-180.

Funk (Emil.) De Thebanorum ab an. 378 usque ad an. 362 actis. gr. 4, 15 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Gehrmann (Benno). Demosthenis Thracis μεταβολῶν Ὀδυσσεύς fragmenta. Diss. gr. 8, 44 S. Königsberg i-Pr., *Koch*. m. 1.

Gilbert (Otto). Geschichte u. Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum. 3. Abtlg. gr. 8, iv, 479 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10. (cplt. m. 24.)

Goetz (Geo.) *Emendationes militis gloriosi Plautinae.* 4, viii S. Jena, *Neuenhahn.* m. —50.

Gruppe (Otto). Die rhapsodische Theogonie u. ihre Bedeutung innerhalb der orphischen Litteratur. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol." 17. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8, S. 689-747. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 1.60.

Guenther (Paul). De ea, quae inter Timaeum et Lycophronem intercedit, ratione. Diss. gr. 8, 74 S. Leipzig, *Fock,* 1889. m. 1.20.

Gutscher (Hans). Die attischen Grabschriften. gr. 8, 43 S. Leoben. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 2.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. In Verbindg. m. Autenrieth, Ad. Bauer, Blass, etc., hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. 7. Bd., 2. verm. Aufl. gr. 8. München, *Beck.* m. 13.50; Einbd. m. 2. Inhalt: Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf die Zeit Justinians. Von Prof. Wilh. Christ. xii, 769 S. m. 24 Abbildgn.

— 15. Halbbd. Lex.-8, 8. Bd. 1. Abtlg. xvi, 304 S. München, *Beck.* m. 5.50. Inhalt: 8. Bd. Römische Litteraturgeschichte v. Mart. Schanz. 1. Tl. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. xvi, 304 S.

Herodotos' 2. Buch, m. sachlichen Erläuterungen hrsg. v. Alfr. Wiedemann. gr. 8, viii, 624 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 12.

Hesselmeyer (Ellis). Die Pelasgerfrage u. ihre Lösbarkeit. gr. 8, xiv, 162 S. Tübingen, *Fues.* m. 3.60.

Hilgenfeld (Heinr.) L. Annaei Senecae epistulae morales quo ordine et quo tempore sint scriptae, collectae, editae. [Aus "Jahrb. d. class. Philol." 17. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8, S. 601-685. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 2.

Hillebrandt (Alfr.) Die Sonnwendfeste in Alt-Indien. Eine Untersuchg. [Aus "Romanische Forschgn."] gr. 8, 46 S. Erlangen, *Fr. Junge,* 1889. m. 1.50.

Hindorf (Rich.) Leitfaden zur Erlernung der malayischen Umgangssprache. 8, 72 S. Berlin, *C. Heymann's Verl.* cart. m. 2.

Hirschwälder (Bruno). Beiträge zu e. Commentar der unter Lucian's Namen überlieferten Schrift "Lob der Heimat." gr. 4, 14 S. Breslau. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. —80.

Hirth (Paul). Üb. die Substantivierung d. Adjektivums bei Quintilian. gr. 4, 28 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Hoefer (Ulr.) Konon. Text u. Quellenuntersuchg. gr. 8, iv, 116 S. Greifswald, *Bamberg.* m. 2.80.

Hoff (Ludw.) Die Kenntniss Germaniens im Altertum bis zum 2. Jahrh. n. Chr. gr. 8, 86 S. Coesfeld. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.50.

Hoffmann (Otto Adb.) Hermes u. Kerykeion. Mit e. Taf. gr. 8, 52 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Hoehler (Wilh.) Scholia Iuvenaliana inedita. II. gr. 4, 28 S. Ettenheim. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.50. (I. et II., m. 2.50.)

Hölzl (Max.) Fasti praetorii ab a. u. DCLXXXVII usque ad a. u. DCCX. Ed. II. gr. 8, 104 S. Leipzig, *Hinrich's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Holub (Joh.) Noch 30 doppelsinnige Stellen in der Elektra d. Sophokles. gr. 8, 7 S. Prag, *Neugebauer.* m. —40.

Hymnus Homericus in Mercurium ab Arth. Ludwig editus. gr. 4, 52 S. Königsberg i-Pr., *W. Koch's Antiqu.* m. 2.

Jacob (Geo.) E. arabischer Berichterstatte aus dem 10. od. 11. Jahrh. üb. Fulda u. s. w. Zum ersten Male aus dem Arab. übertr. gr. 8, 20 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.

Jahrbuch, biographisches, f. Alterthumskunde. Begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. 11. Jahrg. 1888. gr. 8, iii, 160 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. m. 3; Einzel-Pr. m. 5.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. 18. Jahrg. 1890. Neue Folge. 10. Jahrg. 62-65. Bd. 12 Hfte. Mit den Beiblättern: Bibliotheca philologica classica. 17. Jahrg. 1890 u. Biographisches Jahrb. f. Alterthumskunde. 13. Jahrg. 1890. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 5 Bog. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. m. 30; Ladenpr. m. 36.

Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alfr. Fleckeisen. 17. Suppl.-Bd., 2. (Schluss-)Hft. gr. 8, iii u. S. 351-747. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 6.40.

Ipfelkofer (Adb.) Die Rhetorik d. Anaximenes unter den Werken d. Aristoteles. Diss. gr. 8, 55 S. Würzburg, 1889. München, *Lindauer*. m. —60.

Junghahn (Emil Aug.) Agos-Sühne als politische Forderung bei Thukydides I. 126-139. gr. 4, 33 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Kaestner (Osc.) De aeris, quae ab imperio Caesaris Octaviani constituto initium duxerint. Diss. gr. 8, 94 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Kalb (Wilh.) Roms Juristen, nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt. gr. 8, viii, 154 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.

Kirste (J.) Die Aussprache d. Visarga. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 22 S. Wien, *Tempisky in Comm.* m. —50.

Klein (Johs.) Die Mythopöie d. Sophokles in seinen Thebanischen Tragödien. gr. 4, 35 S. Eberswalde, *Rust's Nachf.* m. 1.

Köhler (Albr.) Üb. die Sprache der Briefe d. P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (Cicero ep. ad. fam. XII, 14 u. 15). gr. 8, 43 S. Nürnberg, *Ballhorn*. m. 1.

Kopecky (Jos.) Die attischen Trieren. gr. 8, ix, 154 S. m. 31 Abbildgn. Leipzig, *Veit & Co.* m. 5.60.

Koerte (Alfr.) Metrodori Epicurei fragmenta collegit. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol." 17. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8, S. 531-597. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Krüger (K. W.) Griechische Sprachlehre f. Schulen. 1. Tl. 2. Hft. Syntax. 6. verb. Aufl., besorgt v. W. Pökel. gr. 8, 1. Lfg. 64 S. Weimar, *Krüger*. m. 4.

Kudatku Bilik. Fcsm. der uigur. Handschrift der k. k. Hofbibliothek in Wien. Hrsg. v. W. Radloff. Fol., xiii, 200 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort. in Comm.* m. 50.

Kunz (Frz.) Die älteste römische Epik in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Homer. gr. 8, 26 S. Unter-Meidling. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Larsen (Sofus Chr.) Studia critica in Plutarchi moralia. gr. 8, 152 S. Kopenhagen, *Hagerup*, 1889. m. 3.

Lattmann (Herm.) Selbständiger u. bezogener Gebrauch der Tempora im Lat. gr. 8, vi, 150 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 3.60.

Lederer (Siegfr.) Ist Vergil der Verfasser von "Culex" u. "Ciris"? gr. 8, 16 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Lexikon, ausführliches, der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie, im Verein m. Th. Birt, O. Crusius, W. Deecke, etc., hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher. Mit zahl-

reichen Abbildgn. 16. u. 17. Lfg. Lex.-8, I. Bd. viii u. Sp. 2689-3024. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 2. (I. Bd. 2 Abtlgn. m. 34.)

Liebenam (W.) Zur Geschichte u. Organisation d. römischen Vereinswesens. gr. 8, viii, 334 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10.

Litteraturdenkmäler, lateinische, d. XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Max Herrmann u. Siegf. Szamatólski. 1. Hft. 8. Berlin, *Speyer & Peters*, 1891. m. 1.80. Inhalt: Gulielmus Gnapheus, Acolastus. Hrsg. v. Johs. Bolte. xxvii, 83 S.

Loch (Ed.) De titulis graecis sepulcralibus. Diss. gr. 8, 62 S. Regimonti. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.60.

Lohsee (Ernst.) Tulliana. gr. 4, 18 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Luchs (Aug.) Emendationum Livianarum particula IV. gr. 4, 15 S. Erlangen, *Blaesing*. m. —80. (I-IV. m. 3.)

Ludwig (Alfr.) Üb. Methode bei Interpretation d. Rgveda. [Aus "Abhandlgn. der k. böhm. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 72 S. Prag, *Rivndt in Comm.* m. 3.

Menge (Herm.) Materialien zur Repetition der griechischen Syntax. 2 Tle. in 1 Bd. gr. 8, iv, 76 u. 76 S. Wolfenbüttel, *Zwissler*. m. 2.

Meusel (H.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. XIV et XV. Lex.-8, 2. Bd. Sp. 977-1344. Berlin, *W. Weber's Verl.* à m. 2.40.

Meyer (G. Alfr.) Deutsche Prosalektüre in den Mittelklassen höherer Lehranstalten. gr. 4, 22 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Meyer (Paul.) Straboniana. gr. 4, 34 S. Grimma, *Gensel*. m. 1.

Müller (Joh.) Üb. die Pflege der Wissenschaft bei den Römern. 8, 23 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner*. m. —80.

Mueller (Walther.) Quaestiones vestiariae. gr. 8, vi, 53 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Sort.* m. 1.

Murr (Johs.) Die Pflanzenwelt in der griechischen Mythologie. gr. 8, viii, 324 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner*. m. 6.

Naguiewski (Darius.) In quaestiones Sapphicas observationes. gr. 8, 16 S. Casani. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Nehring (Karl.) Der lateinische Aufsatz. gr. 4, 17 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Neue (Frdr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Bd. Adjectiva, u. s. w. 3., gänzlich neu bearb. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. 9. u. 10. Lfg. gr. 8, S. 513-640. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. à m. 1.50; Ladenpr. à m. 2.

Osthoff (Herm.) u. Brugmann (Karl.) Morphologische Untersuchungen. 5. (Schluss-)Thl., m. e. Sach- u. Wortregister zu allen 5 Thln. gr. 8, viii, 268 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 7. (cplt. m. 34.)

Otto (A.) Die Sprichwörter u. sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer. gr. 8, xlv, 436 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10.

Philippi (Adf.) Einige Bemerkungen üb. den philologischen Unterricht. Akademische Rede. hoch 4, 38 S. Giessen, *Ricker*. m. 1.

Philologus. Zeitschrift f. das class. Alterthum. Begründet v. F. W. Schneidewin u. E. v. Leutsch. Hrsg. v. Otto Crusius. Neue Folge. 3. Bd. [Der ganzen Reihe 49. Bd.] 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 1. Hälfte 88 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 17.

Phoenix, seu nuntius latinus internationalis. Fasc. 1, 4 Nrn. (½ B.) Lex.-8. London, *Nutt*. m. 2.

Planudis (Maximi) monachi epistulae ed. Max. Treu. gr. 8, ix, 275 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 6.

Plauti (T. Macci) comoediae. Rec. Frdr. Ritschellius, socii operae adsumptis G. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi IV, fasc. 1. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 5.60. Inhalt: Casina, rec. Frdr. Schoell. xl, 172 S.

Pollio (C. Asinius). Bericht üb. die spanischen Unruhen d. J. 48 v. Chr. (Bellum Alexandrinum 48-64), neu hrsg. v. Gust. Landgraf. gr. 8, 32 S. Leipzig, *Deichert Nachf.* m. 1.

Ponickau (Rich. Bruno). De Isocratis Demonicea. Diss. gr. 8, 52 S. Stendal, 1889. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Porphirii quaestionum homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit Herm. Schrader. gr. 8, x, 217 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10.

Porta linguarum orientalium, inchoavit J. H. Petermann, continuavit Herm. L. Strack. Pars XIII. 8. Berlin, *Reuther*. m. 7. Inhalt: Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum. Carmina selegit et ed. Th. Noeldeke, glossarium confecit A. Mueller. xv, 240 S.

Prym (Eug.) u. Socin (Alb.) Kurdische Sammlungen. 2. Abtlg. Hft. a u. b. Lex.-8. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 8.60. (1. u. 2. m. 11.10.) a. Die Texte. xv-lviii u. S. 71-350. m. 5.60.—b. Uebersetzung. S. 99-284. m. 3.

Pulvermacher (N.) De Georgicis a Vergilio retractatis. gr. 8, 118 S. Berlin, *Heinrich & Kemke*. m. 2.

Rabe (Hugo). De Theophrasti libris *περί λέξεως*. Diss. gr. 8, 48 S. Bonnae, Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Radloff (W.) Versuch e. Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialekte. 3. Lfg. hoch 4, Sp. 641-960. St. Petersburg, *Eggers & Co.* Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 3. (1-3 m. 9.60.)

Reinisch (Leo). Die Saho-Sprache. 2. Bd. Wörterbuch. gr. 8, viii, 492 S. Wien, *Hölder*. m. 24. (1. u. 2. m. 32.)

Ribbeck (Wold.) Übersetzungsproben. gr. 4, 26 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1.

Ries (Jul.) De Aeneae Tactici commentario poliorcetico. Diss. gr. 8, 44 S. Halis Sax. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Sauppe (Herm.) Commentatio de phratriis atticis altera. gr. 4, 11 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* à m. —80.

Schau (Rob.) De formulis, quas poetae graeci in conclusione orationis directae posuerint. Diss. gr. 4, 33 S. Tilsae. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Schmidt (M. A.) Üb. das Homerische in Sophokles' Aias. gr. 8, 52 S. Waidhofen. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.80.

Schmidt (Johs.) Die Urheimath der Indogermanen u. das europäische Zahl-system. [Aus "Abhandlungen d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss."]. gr. 4, 56 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer in Comm.* m. 2.50.

Schmidt (Carolus). De articulo in nominibus propriis apud Atticos scriptores pedestres. Diss. gr. 8, 82 S. Kiliae. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Schubert (Rud.) Herodots Darstellung der Cyrussage. gr. 8, iii, 85 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 2.40.

Schvarcz (Jul.) Kritik der Staatsformen d. Aristoteles. Verm. Ausg. Lex.-8, v, 138 S. Eisenach, *Bacmeister*. m. 3.60.

Sili Italici Punica, ed. Ludov. Bauer. Vol. I., libros I-X continens. 8, xviii, 240 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Sobolewski (Sergius). De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. gr. 8, vi, 229 S. Moskau, *Lang*. m. 4.

Sonntag (M.) Bemerkungen zu Caesar de b. G. IV 17. gr. 4, 9 S. Frankfurt a-O. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —60.

Spanoghe (Em.) Emendationes Tullianae. Miscella. gr. 8, vii, 67 S. Leiden, *Brill*. m. 1.70.

Sprengel (Johs. Geo.) De ratione, quae in historia plantarum inter Plinium et Theophrastum intercedit. Diss. gr. 8, 63 S. Marpurgi Cattorum. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Steinthal (H.) Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen u. Römern m. besond. Rücksicht auf die Logik. 2., verm. u. verb. Aufl., 1. Tl. gr. 8, xvi, 374 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* m. 8.

Strassmaier (J. N., S. J.) Babylonische Texte. 8. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Pfeiffer*. m. 12 (1-8. m. 112). Inhalt: Inschriften v. Cambyses, König v. Babylon (529-521 v. Chr.), v. den Thontafeln d. britischen Museums copirt u. autogr. 1. Hft. Nr. 1-285. Vom Regierungsantritt bis zum 5. Jahre der Regierg. 160 S.

— 9. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Pfeiffer*. m. 12. (1-9. m. 124.) Inhalt: Inschriften v. Cambyses, König v. Babylon (529-521 v. Chr.), v. den Thontafeln d. britischen Museums copirt u. autogr. 2. Hft. Nr. 286-441 u. 5 Register. viii, 28 S. u. S. 161-256.

Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archäologie. 11. Bd., 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Einzel-Pr. à m. 1.50. Inhalt: 1. Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt? Eine Untersuchg. v. Otto Dingeldein. 46 S.—2. Maximiani elegiae. Ad fidem codicis Etonensis rec. et emendavit M. Petschenig. 40 S.

— 11. Bd., 3. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Einzel-Pr. m. 3.50. (1-3. m. 6.50; 11. Bd. cplt. m. 5.20.) Inhalt: Medien u. das Haus d. Kyaxares. Von J. V. Prásek. 110 S.

Studien, Bonner. Aufsätze aus der Altertumswissenschaft. Reinhard Kekulé zur Erinnerung gewidmet. Lex.-8, iv, 260 S. m. eingedr. Abbildgn. u. 12 z. Th. farb. Taf. Berlin, *Spemann*. m. 20.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. 12. Bd., 2. Hft. gr. 8, v u. S. 233-386. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 4. (12. Bd. cplt. m. 10.)

Tallqvist (K. L.) Die Sprache der Contracte Nabû-Nâ'id's (555-538 v. Chr.) gr. 8, xviii, 148 S. Helsingfors. Leipzig, *Pfeiffer*. m. 5.

Teuffel's (W. S.) Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Neu bearb. v. Ludw. Schwabe. 5. Aufl., 2. Bd. gr. 8, viii u. S. 649-1346. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 7.20. (cplt. m. 14.40.)

T'oung pao. Archives pour servir à l'étude de l'histoire, des langues, de la géographie et de l'ethnographie de l'Asie orientale. Rédigées par Gust. Schlegel et Henri Cordier. Vol. I. 12 cahiers. gr. 8, 1. Hft. iv, 97 S. Leiden, *Brill*. m. 20.

Ullrich (R.) De libri secundi Tibulliani statu integro et compositione. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol." 17. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8, S. 385-472. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Unger (Geo. Frdr.) Die Abfassungszeit der ägyptischen Festkalender. [Aus "Abhandlgn. der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 69 S. München, *Franz Verl. in Comm.* m. 2.10.

Verhandlungen der 40. Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Görlitz vom 2.-5. Oktbr. 1889. gr. 4, viii, 503 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 12.

Vogt (Paul). De Luciani libellorum pristino ordine quaestiones. Particula I. gr. 8, 40 S. m. 5 Tab. Marpurgi Cattorum, 1889. Cassel, *Hühn.* m. 1.50.

Vollmann (Frz.) Üb. das Verhältnis der späteren Stoa zur Sklaverei im römischen Reiche. gr. 8, 98 S. Stadtamhof. Regensburg, *Coppenrath's Verl.* m. —75.

Weber (Hugo). Quaestiones Catullianae. gr. 8, viii, 172 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* m. 4.

Weisslovitz (Nath.) Prinz u. Derwisch. Ein ind. Roman. Mit e. Anh. v. Fritz Hommel. gr. 8, iv, 178 S. München, *Th. Ackermann's Verl.* m. 5.40.

Weisweile (Jos.) Das lateinische participium futuri passivi in seiner Bedeutung u. syntaktischen Verwendung. Grammatische Studie. gr. 8, vii, 146 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* m. 2.80.

Westermeyer (Ant. Bern.) Die semitisch-ursprachliche Grundlage der griechischen Deklination u. der indogermanischen überhaupt. gr. 8, 84 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* m. 2.

Wiegandt (Leop.) C. Jul. Caesar u. die tribunizische Gewalt. gr. 8, 53 S. Dresden. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.20.

Wormstall (Alb.) De Corinthiacis tabellis fictilibus. gr. 8, 42 S. Monasterii Guestf. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.20.

Wüstenfeld (F.) Der Imâm el-Schâfi', seine Schüler u. Anhänger bis zum J. 300 d. H. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen."] gr. 4, 106 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 5.

Xenophontis historia graeca. Recensuit Otto Keller. Ed. maior cum apparatu critico et indice verborum. gr. 8, xxviii, 427 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 10.

Zander (Carolus). Versus italici antiqui. Collegit, recensuit, rationem metricam explicavit C. Z. gr. 8, vii, ccxxii, 124 S. Lund, *Möller.* m. 5.

Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie u. verwandte Gebiete, in Verbindg. m. J. Oppert, A. H. Sayce, Eb. Schrader u. Anderen hrsg. v. Carl Bezold. 5. Bd., Jahrg. 1890. 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 136 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze.* m. 18; einzelne Hfte. m. 5.

— der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Hrsg. v. den Geschäftsführern Aug. Müller, Pischel, Krehl, Windisch unter der Red. v. E. Windisch. 44. Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. vii, 202 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm.* m. 15.

ITALIAN.

Barillari (Mich.) Studi sulla satira latina. Messina. 16mo. L. 2.50.

Jachino. Varietà tradizionali e dialettali Alessandrine. Torino. L. 2.

Lactantius (L. C. F.) Opera omnia, recension. S. Brandt et G. Laubmann. Parte I. Divinae institutiones et epitome divinarum institutionum. Milano. gr. 8vo. L. 30. (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum. Nuova serie. Vol. IV.)

Museo italiano di antichità classica diretto da Dom. Comparetti. Volume

III, puntata II e III. Firenze. 4to, 255 p., 3 tavole. L. 20. Milano: Dionysos di Prassitele. Vitelli: Spicilegio fiorentino. Sabbadini: Storia e critica di alcuni testi latini. Tomasetti: Note sui prefetti di Roma. Sogliano: Intorno al supposto Archita, busto ercolanese in bronzo. Halbheer: Iscrizioni cretesi.

Omero. Iliade, libro I, con note di A. Franco. Verona. 12mo, 94 p. L. 1.20.

— Ilias, Rhapsodie I. Testo rived. da A. F. Verona. 12mo, 23 p. L. —30.

Pais (A.) Il teatro di L. Anneo Seneca. Torino. 8vo, 149 p. L. 3.

Zuretti (C. O.) Scolii al Pluto ed alle Rane di Aristofane dal Codice Veneto 472, dal Cod. Crem. 12229, L. 6. 28. Torino. 8vo, 121 p. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aus der Anomia. Archaeologische Beitræge Carl Robert zur Erinnerung an Berlin dargebracht. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 7 m.

Bayfield (M. A.) Latin Prose for Lower Forms. Being a series of exercises adapted to Prof. Postgate's New and First Latin Primers. London, Paris, and Melbourne, *Cassell & Co.*, 1890.

Black Beauty, his grooms and companions, the 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' of the horse. 19 Milk St., Boston, *The American Humane Education Society*. 12 cts.

Bloomfield (Maurice). The Kāuṣika Sutra of the Atharva-Veda. With extracts from the commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. Ed. by M. B. in *Journal of Am. Oriental Society* for 1890 (Vol. XIV).

Bonnet (Max). Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours. Paris, *Librairie Hachette et Cie.*, 1890.

— Narratio de miraculo a Michaelle archangelo Chonis patrato, adiecto Symeonis metaphrastae de eadem re libello. Ed. M. B. Paris, *Librairie Hachette et Cie.*, 1890.

Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. With notes and a sketch of Bunyan's life. By D. H. Montgomery. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 30 cts.

Campbell (D. H.) Elements of Structural and Systematic Botany. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890.

Caesaris (C. Iulii). Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Erkl. von Friedrich Kraner. 15te verb. Auflage von W. Dittenberger. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 2 m. 25 pf.

— Commentarii de Bello Civili. Erkl. von Friedrich Kraner. 10te vielf. umgearbeitete Aufl. von Friedrich Hofmann. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 2 m. 25 pf.

Catulli (C. Valeri) Carmina. Recognovit Ioh. P. Postgate. London, *George Bell & Sons*, 1889.

Christ (Wilhelm). Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf die Zeit Justinians. Zweite verm. Auflage. Mit 24 Abbildungen. (Handbuch der kl. Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. von Iwan von Müller. VII Band.) München, *C. H. Beck*, 1890.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli) *Orationes selectae*. Scholarum in usum ed. H. Nohl. Vol. VI. *Philippicarum libri I, II, III*. Ed. minor (50 pf.). Ed. maior (80 pf.). Vienna, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1890.

Cicero, pro Roscio. With introduction and notes by St. George Stock. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 90 cts.

Collectio Librorum Iuris Anteiusinianum. Tomus Tertius. *Fragmenta Vaticana*. Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio. Recogn. Theodorus Mommsen. Consultatio veteris cuiusdam iurisconsulti. Ed. Paulus Krüger. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 4 m. 60 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. XIX. L. Caeli Firmiani Lactantia Opera Omnia recc. Samuel Brandt et Georgius Laubmann. Pars I. *Divinae Institutiones et Epitome*. Rec. Samuel Brandt. Vienna, *F. Tempisky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. 25 m.

Deering (Waller). *The Anglo-Saxon Poets on the Judgment Day*. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1890.

Demosthenes. *Ausgew. Reden*. Erkl. von Anton Westermann. Drittes Bändchen. XXIII, LIV, LVII. Dritte, verbesserte Aufl. besorgt von E. Rosenberg. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 1 m. 80 pf.

Dingeldein (Otto). Haben die Theatermasken der Alten die Stimme verstärkt? Eine Untersuchung. (Berliner Studien für classische Philologie u. Archaeologie XI 1.) Berlin, *S. Calvary Co.* 1 m. 50 pf.

Dissertationes Philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. Alterum. Vienna and Prague, *F. Tempisky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. 8 m.

Epitomes of Three Sciences. Comparative Philology (Oldenberg). Comparative Psychology (Jastrow). Old Testament History (Cornill). Chicago, *The Open Court Publishing Co.*, 1890. 75 cts.

ΕΥΘΥΦΡΩΝ. Platonis Euthyphro. With introduction and notes by J. Adam. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Fox (H. F.) and Bromley (T. M.) *Models and Exercises in Unseen Translation*. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. \$1.40.

Francke (Kuno). *Modern Ideas in the Middle Ages*. (Deprint Modern Language Association, 1890.)

Gomperz (Theodor). Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung griechischer Schriftsteller IV. Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien. Wien, *In Commission bei F. Tempisky*, 1890.

Grundriss der germanischen Philologie unter Mitwirkung von K. von Amira, W. Arndt u. A. herausg. von Hermann Paul. II. Band, 1. Abteil. 4. Lief. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1890.

Gurney (E. H.) *Reference Handbook of English History*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 85 cts.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. von Iwan von Müller. Fünfzehnter Halbband enth. Band VIII, 1. Teil. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Von Martin Schanz. Erster Teil. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1890.

Hardy (A. S.) *Elements of Differential and Integral Calculus*. Method of Rates. By A. S. Hardy. Boston, *Ginn & Co.* \$1.65.

Hardy (E. G.) Plutarch's Lives of Galba and Otho. With introduction and explanatory notes. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.* \$1.40.

Harvard University Publications. (Historical Monographs. No. 1. The Veto Power, by E. C. Mason.) Ed. by A. B. Hart. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.10.

Herodotus. V. Terpsichore. With introduction, notes and map, by E. S. Schuckburgh. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Hessels (J. H.) An Eighth Century Anglo-Saxon Glossary. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge MS No. 144. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Horatius (Q. H. Flaccus). Erkl. von Adolf Kiessling. Erster Teil. Oden u. Epoden. 2te verbesserte Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 3 m.

— Rec. I. G. Orelli. Ed. Quarta Maior. Vol. II. Fasc. II. Post I. G. Baiterum curavit W. Mewes. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1890. 4 m.

Hussey (George B.) The Distribution of Hellenic Temples.

— Greek Sculptured Crowns and Crown Inscription. (Papers of the American School at Athens.)

Hyde (E. W.) The Directional Calculus. Based upon the methods of Hermann Grassmann. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.65.

International American Conference Papers. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1890.

Ipfelkofer (A.) Die Rhetorik des Anaximenes unter den Werken des Aristoteles. (Progr.) Würzburg, 1889.

Isokrates' Panegyrikos. Für den Schulgebr., herausg. von Bruno Keil. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. 75 pf.

Iosephi (Flavii) Opera. Ed. et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. Vol. IV. Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri XVI-XX et Vita. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 14 m.

Iuvenalis (D. Iunii) Satira Septima. Texte Latin. Publié avec un commentaire critique, explicatif et historique par J. A. Hild. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, 1890.

Iuenci (C. Vetti Aquilini) evangeliorum libri quattuor ex rec. Iohannis Huemer (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Vol. XXIV). Vienna, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890.

Iuencus, A Study of, by J. T. Hatfield. (J. H. Univ. Diss.) Bonn, *Carl Georgi*, 1890.

Lane (W. C.) The Dante Collections in the Harvard College and Boston Public Libraries. (Bibliographical Contributions of Harvard University.) Cambridge, Mass., *Library of Harvard University*, 1890.

Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch von Gustav Körting. Erste Lieferung. Paderborn, *Ferdinand Schöningh*, 1890. 2 m.

Litchfield (Mary E.) The Nine Worlds. Stories from Norse mythology. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 60 cts.

Livi (T.) ab Urbe Condita Libri ed. Antonius Zingerle. Pars II, Liber VI-X. Ed. minor, 1 m. Ed. mai., 1 m. 20. Vienna and Prague, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890.

Livy. Book V. Ed. by L. Whibley. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Macy (Jesse). Our Government. Revised ed. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 85 cts.

Matzke (John E.) Dialectische Eigenthümlichkeiten in der Entwicklung des mouillierten L im Französischen. Transactions of Modern Language Association, Vol. V, No. 2.

Maximiani Elegiae. Ad fidem Codicis Etonensis rec. et emendavit M. Petschenig. (Berliner Studien für classische Philologie u. Archaeologie, XI 2.) Berlin, *S. Calvary*, 1890.

Medien u. das Haus des Kyaxares. Von J. V. Präserk. (Berliner Studien für classische Philologie u. Archaeologie, Elfter Band, Drittes Heft.) Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1890.

Meleager, Fifty Poems of. With a translation by Walter Headlam. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. \$2.50.

Mitteilungen aus dem gesammten Gebiet der englischen Sprache u. Litteratur. Beiblatt zur Anglia, No. II, Mai, 1890.

Montgomery (D. H.) The Leading Facts of American History. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.10.

Müller (F. Max). Three Lectures on the Science of Language. Chicago, *The Open Court Publishing Co.*, 1890. 75 cts.

Müller (H. D.) Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des indogermanischen Verbalbaus. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1890. 4 m.

Müller (Lucian). De Accii fabulis disputatio. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1890. 2 m.

— De Horatii Epistularum II 1, 50-62 Disputatio. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*

Nicolassen (G. F.) Notes on Latin and Greek. Baltimore, *Press of Isaac Friedenwald*, 1890.

Paul (Hermann). Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. Herausg. von H. P. I. Band, 4. Lieferung, mit einer Karte. II. Band, 1 Abteilung, 3. Lief. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1890.

Perrin (M. L.) Ueber Thomas Castelford's Chronik von England. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 50 cts.

Platons Gorgias. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. von A. Th. Christ. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1890. 60 kr.

Postgate (J. P.) First Latin Primer. London, Paris, and Melbourne, *Cassell & Co.*, 1890.

Preble and Parker. Handbook of Latin Writing. Revised ed. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 55 cts.

Römische Elegiker (Catull, Tibull, Propertius, Ovid) in Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch, herausg. von Alfred Riese. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. 1 m.

Römische Elegiker. Eine Auswahl aus Catull, Tibull, Propertius u. Ovid. Für den Schulgebr. bearbeitet von K. P. Schulze. 3te Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1890. 2 m. 40 pf.

Rutherford (W. Gunion). First Greek Syntax. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Herausg. von Hermann

Collitz. Zweiter Band. II Heft. Die Orakelinschriften aus Dodona. Die Inschriften Achaia's u. seiner Colonieen. Bearbeitet von Otto Hoffmann. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1890. 2 m. 60 pf.

Sidney (Sir Philip). The Defense of Poesy, otherwise known as an Apology for Poetry. Edited with introduction and notes by Albert S. Cook. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 55 cts.

Smith, G. J. Synopsis of English and American Literature. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.25.

Sobolewski (Sergius). De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. Moscow, 1890.

Stowasser (J. M.) Dunkle Wörter. Lexikalisches. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890.

Sweet (Henry). A Primer of Spoken English. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Taciti (Cornelii). Ab Excessu Divi Augusti. Libri I-III. Scholarum in usum rec. Robertus Novak. Prague, *J. L. Kober*, 1890.

Thayer (W. R.) The Best Elizabethan Plays. Marlowe's Jew of Malta, Jonson's Alchemist, Beaumont and Fletcher's Philaster, Fletcher and Shakespeare's Two Noble Kinsmen, Webster's Duchess of Malfi. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890.

Theophrasti de prima philosophia libellus ab H. Usenero editus. Index Scholarum Bonnensium. 1890.

Usener (Hermann). Der heilige Theodosios. Schriften des Theodoros u. Kyrillos. Herausg. von H. U. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1890.

Virgil. Aeneid, Books I-III. Edited with introduction and notes by T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 75 cts.

Webster's First Bunker Hill Address. (Annotated English Classics.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890.

Wentworth (G. A.) School Algebra. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.25.

Wentzel (G.) De Grammaticis Graecis Quaestiones Selectae I. ΕΠΙΚΑΛΗΣΕΙΣ sive de deorum cognominibus per grammaticorum Graecorum scripta dispersis. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1890.

Williams (R. O.) Our Dictionaries and other English language notes. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1890.

Zanardelli (M. T.) L'étrusque, l'ombrien et l'osque dans quelques-uns de leurs rapports intimes avec l'italien. (Extrait du Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie de Bruxelles. Tome VIII. 1889-90.)